



BOSTON, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1850.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONSPIRACY

To Destroy the Character

OF

ELDER J. V. HIMES.

AND TO WREST FROM HIM THE "ADVENT HERALD."

This is fully shown in a pamphlet of 135 pages, which has long been promised, and purports to have emanated from the Chardon-street Church, which is a gross deception on the face of it—it having come from some disaffected persons, who have gone out from that Church, and who meet in "Cochituate Hall." The developments, contradictions, and evidence of the existence of those "Secret Workings," will be duly considered.

This extended pamphlet, entitled: "The Trial of Eld J. V. Himes before the Chardon-st. Church, together with a vindication of the course taken by Prof. J. P. Weethee and Elder George Needham, relative to the late difficulties," as before announced, is now published. It is the last act in the persevering crusade against my reputation, and yet its authors had not the courtesy to send me a copy, but denied me the possession of one, till others should be first supplied. Money was deposited with them for two copies as early as Monday, when others were receiving, and yet I was not permitted to receive them till Wednesday night, when it would have been too late to have noticed it in the paper of that week, had not one been obtained by the kindness of a friend.

Were all its readers familiar with the detail of all matters therein referred to, it would not be necessary to make any farther allusion to it; it would be its own sufficient refutation. Or had all the brethren and sisters been present at the meetings of the Conference in the spring and summer, they would only need to read the sneers in it, made against them, the slurs cast on them, the disrespectful and unkind insinuations uttered respecting them, and the contempt heaped on them, to be able to judge correctly of its spirit, and to make due allowance for all the statements therein contained. But as there are many worthy friends scattered all over the land, who may honestly suppose the statements are correct until their minds are disabused, it will not be dealing justly, in the eye of God, to leave them deceived, without placing within their reach the materials for a righteous judgment in the case.

The pamphlet contains much irrelevant matter, and many collateral issues not material to the case. They will be noticed when necessary; but the main point will be the one to which attention is principally directed,—viz.: *the plot to effect my destruction, and wrest from me the proprietorship of the "Advent Herald."*

The pamphlet commences with a narration of the private history of Eld. J. P. Weethee. It does not differ materially from that which was written for the "Advent Herald" by himself, and published as editorial in the number of Sept. 23, 1848.

The first that we knew of him was by a letter received from him in the fall of 1842, and signed as President of Beverly College, Beverly, Ohio. Of the standing of that institution we knew, and now know, nothing; but as he wished Bro. Bliss to say nothing of that institution, and only refer to his connection with Madison College, when Bro. B. was about to introduce him to the librarian at Harvard University, Cambridge, the inference is that the latter\* was

superior to it. All that I know of his personal history has been received from himself. And here I would take occasion to disavow any disrespectful allusions to his acquirements, or stigma on his past history whatever. I have no occasion to detract from any laurels he may have earned, and have not thought of doing so. Others have called his scholarship in question, I have not: the greater the man, the greater is the wonder at his present position. Eld. Needham, in what is called his "plea," page 110, represents me as denying him "education enough to fill a Professor's chair," and asserts that I "held up a hand-bill having on it 'Prof. Weethee,' and sneeringly pronounced *Professor Weethee*," and goes on to show his degrees, &c., from which it appears (page 94) that he, with a class of three others, graduated in 1832, with the degree of A. B. at the Ohio University, and in 1835 with sixteen others was made an M. A. by the same institution—a degree conferred on students three years after they graduate. Now I never thought of sneering at the word Professor, but having never heard of it before in connection with his name,—and there being no mention of it in the account he gave, at my request, of his former standing and honors, in the "Herald" referred to,—I marveled that he should have substituted it for that of President, which he had previously used—taking a *lower* for a *higher* title. By his own statement it appears that, from being unable "to read accurately, and unaccustomed to society," he "completed a six years' course in four years and a half," and then after studying medicine two years, was elected, at the age of twenty-two, President of Madison College in Pennsylvania, and ex-officio Professor.\* Instead of detracting from him any merit, I would extend to him the full meed of praise. Indeed, most persons would have had to study three years before they could have been admitted to a New England College; and few persons would have been elevated at so young an age to the office of President of an institution of celebrity. Because others choose to call in question his scholarship, I am not to be held responsible for that, and why he goes into those matters here I am unable to divine, unless he conceived it a fit opportunity to publish to the world his achievements in the fields of science.

As his past history is unquestioned by me, a certificate of his conduct while in Cincinnati, where I first recommended him to the Adventists, which he gives on page 3, needs no formal notice here.

On p. 5, he reveals the first insight into the origin of his present state of mind. In the winter of 1847-8, he wrote "twenty-two numbers on the 'Fourth Monarchy,' for the writing of which he received nothing," and "looked from week to week for some editorial remark," respecting the views advocated, "but nothing appeared." It seems that his spirit was grieved at this neglect, that he conceived himself *slighted* respecting his articles, and not remunerated for them. There was no disposition to slight him, but there was every motive to secure his friendship. It is not however deemed proper by the conductors of the "Herald" to eulogise a man or his works above what they consider their just merits. Those articles were not regarded as sound in the position taken, and were published at his request, no objection being made to their publication. With regard to remuneration, he of course received nothing but the gratification of seeing his views in print, and the privilege of spreading them before the readers of the "Herald" for their adoption or rejection. Nor was he charged† anything for their insertion.

some of the Professors becoming in favor of lay representation in the Church polity, the then Bishops put their feet upon it and broke it up. It then fell into the hands of the Cumberland Presbyterians, who being unable to sustain a College here, gave it up, and it is now for the acceptance of our Church."

\* In the smaller Colleges the President has to teach, and hear recitations, and is a Professor by virtue of his office.

† Others have taken pay for less matter under similar circumstances.—Inquire of Bro. Gross.

His next complaint is, that his "Armageddon" was not noticed for "three weeks" from the time it was sent from Ohio to Boston, and then "a short editorial appears—'pleased with the style and with some of the ideas, but from others we are obliged to dissent.' Not a word said as to what was approved or condemned. No extract appeared," &c.—p. 5.

Here was felt slight No. 2. It was, however, regarded as the most respectful way of expressing dissent from it, without paining him with direct opposition. There has been no cause seen since for approving it, or need for reviewing it. Its author had opportunity himself to speak of it under the editorial head, and did so according to his discretion. (See "Herald" of Aug. 11th, 1849.) The sensitiveness here exhibited, gives much insight into what was dark and mysterious in this business. It shows how

— "Trifles light as air"

have been in his mind,

"Confirmation strong as Holy Writ," in giving shape to the conceptions of his jealous imagination, beyond his own consciousness of so doing. It explains how he has been enabled to magnify mole hills until they have loomed up before him mountain high. Had we known his sensitiveness in this respect, it might have been guarded against by a due mixture of praise. We did not look for such a foible in a man coming from so distinguished a position.

As on pp. 7 and 10 he complains bitterly of a want of remuneration for the edition of this work—published by me after he had published it at the West, and circulated it all over the country,—it may be as well here to state, that he is entirely mistaken with regard to the 10 per cent. when he says, "I understood him to say (and of which I feel sure) that he would do with me as with others; and from my recollection that was stated to be 10 per cent." Nothing was said of the per centage—no per centage having been paid to any one, and he has been remunerated equally with others. When he first manifested disappointment in the sum received, he was told to make out the amount of his claim and he should be satisfied in full. He has been frequently urged to this, but acknowledges on p. 11 that he refused to take anything, having preferred to lay it aside to be added to his other matters of grief. On p. 22 he complains that he has "received only a part of the one hundred copies" that were put to his credit, "and have sold only four copies." It is his own neglect that he had not received them, they are on the shelf waiting his order. We attach no blame to him for his want of success in selling.

Eld. W. next complains that on his return to Cincinnati, from his visit East, in the fall of '48, that his receipts had fallen short of his expenses "about twenty dollars"—p. 6; whereas he claims that I had agreed to bear his expenses, but confesses on p. 11, that on this same visit he "refused to suffer the Hester-street Church to lift a collection for him. I never thought of paying all his expenses in addition to all his receipts. If they were not met, it was because he never made me acquainted with that fact.—Had he done so, the next mail would have returned to him whatever he lacked. He was at fault, if dissatisfied, in not making a manly statement of his deficit, if he has been brooding over it all this time. If he only mentions it, as he states, for the purpose of correcting a remark which he puts into my mouth, and which I never made, that he "fleeced the churches," then he is more at fault still, and is deserving of censure for opening his ears to all the gossip that is afloat, without first inquiring whether such words had been used. They were doubtless carried to him by the person who brought the claim from him that he should have had his expenses paid, and what the churches gave him besides. From his statement it does not appear that the churches gave him anything.—Bro. Robinson says:

"It was I who proposed the contribution for Mr. Weethee on his return from the East to Cincinnati, and which he declined, saying, they had done so liberally before, that it was enough!"

I afterward asked one of the deacons about it, and he stated they raised before, some \$20 or \$25."

His next complaint is, that on his second visit to Boston, he was here eleven weeks—six of which his board was given him—"lonely, without a companion, in the midst of the frozen manners of Boston," often thinking "of the land I had left," before he received any pay for his services—although he confesses that he had at this time \$23, above what he had withdrawn, on deposit at the "Herald" office, and that he was indebted to my exertions, on my return, for calling the attention of brethren to his wants, by which he received what he confesses he acknowledged was satisfactory to him! In this connection he complains that I have not paid to the society—i. e., to his portion of them—\$15, which I subscribed at that time; but makes no allusion to the fact, that I afterwards made no demand for bills to the amount of \$405 79 that I had paid for them; and that I have received not one penny of them for their portion of the rent of the Chapel for the last quarter occupied by the Church, which they claim to be, nor of my offer to offset that subscription against all that might be justly due from their portion of the Society—leaving the remaining \$85 to be paid by the Church and Society that remain. These garbled statements and half-way innuendoes are what mislead.

He then alludes to his great services in the "Herald" office—his spending "nearly one third of my time in writing for the 'Herald,'" for which, with his preaching, making "double duties," he expected a support. It was his own proposition to write. No one was more pleased than himself at the idea of having his Sunday Lecture before the Chardon-street Church, appear in the following number of the "Herald," each week—a privilege which could be granted to but few, and a prominence which others might covet. Many of them, however, were neither written in full originally for the purpose, nor preached new in the Chapel—large portions of them being set up by the printer from a book of old MSS. in his possession, and another large portion being copied from printed books to which he made reference. When his dissatisfaction in pecuniary matters was discovered, he was urged to name the sum he claimed, and he should have been remunerated to his heart's content, if that were possible; but rather than do so, he prefers to make it still a matter of complaint. And yet, on p. 22 he confesses that when I forced \$25 on him for such services, that he said, "I did not ask anything," but he "kept it," lest I "should be offended." Much that he wrote, during this time in the "Herald" office, is still in his own possession—having never been used.

On p. 6 he mentions a carpet-bag I gave him, but makes no allusion to a copy of the "Englishman's Greek Concordance" I presented him, to papers to the amount of \$15 sent to his friends by his direction; or to \$6 he borrowed at the office in my absence for the Society, with which to assist a poor family, which he said he would see was paid by a collection, but which he has not mentioned since,—in all more than \$25. We should not think of mentioning such pitiful things did not his own allusions make it necessary.

On p. 10 he speaks of becoming my pastor. He says: "I say *nominally*, for no man in his sober senses could view it in any other light.—What! I the pastor of an Archbishop?" This will pass for what it is worth. It compares very well with what he says elsewhere about "a private member rising up against his minister."

He next complains that I broke the seal of a letter directed by him to his wife.—p. 12. The letter was written by him when holding his meetings with Bro. Robinson in New York.—We were expecting a line from him respecting his success there, for the "Herald," for that week. On the last day before going to press a letter came to his wife, and supposing it enclosed a note for the paper, I hastened to find her, to get what might be for the "Herald."—She was not at home; I therefore opened the

\* A committee having been appointed by the Protestant Methodist Church to inquire into the condition of Madison College, one of its members thus reports: Uniontown (Pa.), August, 1850.

"The College has not now any Faculty—but a Latin School only is kept in it, by the Messrs. Lyon. It was incorporated in 1826, by the Legislature of this State, and a grant made to it of \$3000, and subsequently Mr. Madison (after whom it is named) bequeathed to it \$1000. In 1826, it was under the patronage of the Methodist Episcopal Church; but Mr. Bascom, (now Bishop,) its President, and



letter to get the note, if enclosed, but finding no separate note for me, put the letter into her hands on her return unread, with a statement of the reason, which she said was "all right." And he never mentioned it to me, but has reported it extensively behind my back, and now tells it, not to me privately—not before two or three—not to the Church—but to the world. I did what confidential friends will do. Had there been a line for the "Herald" and it had not been inserted, there might have been another complaint of neglect! Why was it not his pleasure to give the real reason, instead of the one he has made?

He says on the same page: "It caused me to direct the postmaster to leave my letters in the general delivery." The reader will remember that this was in February. Yet his letters came into my box till June 4th, when having heard that he had complained of the above, handing him a letter I had received, I told him he would henceforth find his letters in the General Delivery, and directed at the Post-office accordingly.

On p. 13 he has given his usual history of things. He makes me say that when there was about a \$100 due him, that "Weethee had no need of money." If he does not know, he could easily have learned, that this also is a misrepresentation, I did not say he had no need of money. I stated that he had no financial responsibilities, as some of us had, that I had done all I ought to do, having to pay at least \$400 for the year; and I thought as he had not built up the Society, and our receipts had fallen off about one quarter since he had been among us, that under these circumstances, he ought to consider the poverty of the brethren, who were doing all they were able to do, and give them some consideration.

He suddenly stopped writing. We could not account for it at the time. He told us then that it was because his health would not permit; but now it seems the cause was: "I considered my services slighted, and myself insulted." Some folks are very easily disconcerted—you know not how to please them. Cowper says:

"Some fretful tempers wince at every touch,  
You always do too little or too much.  
You speak with life in hopes to entertain;  
Your elevated voice goes through the brain!  
You fall at once into a lower key:  
That's worse—the drone pipe of an humble bee!  
The southern sash admits too strong a light!  
You rise and drop the curtain: now 'tis night!  
He shakes with cold—you stir the fire and strive  
To make a blaze—that's roasting him alive.  
Serve him with venison, and he chooses fish;  
With sole—that's just the sort he would not wish."

Nothing, as it now comes out, has been satisfactory to him. "His only pleasure," seems to have been "to be displeased." When all concerned supposed they were conducting towards him with due deference, it after all came short of the "respect" claimed. When all supposed they were conducting towards him with due decorum, he felt insulted. We regret the sensitiveness which has made him liable to such affliction.

But then he regarded me responsible for his support! Indeed! This then explains what he said in reply to information that the pecuniary strength of the Society was decaying under his labors—that the office was good to the amount of his salary! Before he came I gave him my opinion, that he would find no difficulty in sustaining himself here—supposing that he would build us up. But I gave him no intimation that I would do more than give him my whole-hearted support, and which I did. When I, to my surprise, learned that he was looking to me for the payment of his salary, is it strange that I should say, "If I have to do it, I wish to know it?" or that I should feel it necessary to be relieved in future from such an understanding.

On page 14, he makes me say, that "unless the rent is paid, Weethee sha'n't preach in the house." This is another misrepresentation. A brother was writing a subscription, to be signed by those agreeing to pay the salary of Mr. Weethee, without making any provision for the rent. I told him that both ought to be included. Out of this the above report was made. It was explained at the time, but is now reiterated notwithstanding the correction. On the same day he makes me say, "Well, if Bro. Weethee has to go, [i. e. to New York,] I can pay the rent and preach for nothing, as I have done," followed by Bro. Hamblin's reply: "It would be no use for you to attempt it, for you cannot keep up the congregation." The size of the congregation while Eld. W. was pastor, compared with what it was before he came, and what it has been since he left, is the best commentary on that.

On page 14, he says of me, "He has stated that his travelling and visiting the churches were worth to him \$1500 per year." I said that it would make a difference in the business of my office of about \$1500 a year, whether I was confined at home, or went abroad to promote the interest of the cause by public lectures, to make sales for publications, get subscribers for the "Herald," &c., all of which is true. The taunt of Mr. W. may go for what it is worth. Were I cut off from such resources, I should

not have the means to distribute publications, meet the expenses of the office, and give to the support of the Society in Chardon-street, as I have done. Instead of its being so much out of their pocket, it enabled me to put into the Treasury of the Society.

On page 15, he says, "A coal bill amounting to 125 dollars was presented by Mr. Himes."

The facts are these. No coal had been provided by the Church and Society for their use during the season, but they had burned from my own coal. The coal, with expenses in repairing stoves, make \$13—which I carried in and gave them, with other expenses I had been to, making in all, for the year, over \$400. So much for the coal falsehood, which if not the blackest, is because the others are equally exaggerated. (See Society's report.)

On page 16, he complains that Bro. Bliss, who resides in Roxbury, Bro. Apolinio, who resides in South Boston, attend meetings where our views are not treated respectfully, instead of walking in (the former three and three-fourths of a mile) or patronizing a public conveyance on the Sabbath! to attend the Chapel. It is well known that all over the land there are brethren so situated in respect to their families, and in other ways, as to make it justifiable for them to attend elsewhere, when they would prefer attending an Advent Church. These brethren do not go where the doctrine of the Advent is ridiculed or opposed, or where Christian sympathy or respect is withheld from its advocates. Reasons which are known to many, and are satisfactory to our Advent friends, govern them in their course. Recent developments do not cause them to regret that they have not received spiritual instructions through his instrumentality.

In the same connection he complains that a Catholic has been employed in the office. Do none of our friends, or those who complain, employ Catholics in their families, or persons of a different church with themselves? Do not all benevolent Societies do the same? When he thus complains, he causes me to wonder that he does not include my tailor, shoemaker, grocer, paper maker, stereotype founder, &c. I employ those to do the work I wish done, who are able and willing to do it in the manner that is most in accordance with my judgment. If a man shows his competency and faithfulness, I am not such a bigot as to require him to think with me on all points, on pain of having no dealings with him. Had I pursued that course, I should have been where some of these good friends are so much afflicted in having failed to place me.

This brings the question to a point where considerable light is shed on subsequent developments. Elder W. had importuned me to displace Bro. Bliss. He did not say in so many words that he wished for his situation. I frankly stated to Elder W. that the services of Bro. B. were invaluable to the cause, that he was ever ready, by day or by night, to devote himself to its service, that he had shown his ability, integrity, and devotedness to the doctrine of the Advent, and that I did not know of those who could take his place, and be of the same benefit to the cause. When I thus stated, I saw that his vanity was affected, but as Bro. B. had ever spoken with kindness and respect of Elder W., I thought I would not mar their intercourse by mentioning to him the movement made against him, and he knew nothing of it till long subsequently.

With my refusal to displace Bro. B., Elder W. ceased to hold any friendly conversation with me respecting the interests of the cause. I saw that something was on foot, but could not divine what, until a visit of Bro. Pearson, on the Saturday previous to the New York Conference. Subsequent developments have shown that, finding I was not sufficiently supple to yield to his dictation respecting the persons employed in my office, the next object was to effect their removal by destroying my own connection with the "Herald." He now attempts to apologise for this, by saying (page 4), "I always regarded the property belonging to the 'Herald' office as strictly the property of the Advent body, and subject to its control." Yet he was going to hold me personally responsible for the payment of his salary from this public fund!—page 13. On page 87, he says he "had, until recently, been under the impression that all tracts distributed at tent and other meetings, were donations from Elder Himes;" but on page 10 he says, "I was willing to do anything for the cause," not then [i. e. "the last of February,"] suspecting that it was all in fact the private property of J. V. Himes." Which statement shall we believe? To make consistent misstatements requires a good memory.—See Elder N. on "Short Memory," p. 108. Did he not know better? He had read the following from the pen of Bro. Litch, in the "Shield," published in 1844, pages 58, 59, and 85:

"At this juncture, when the storm of opposition grew heavy, the providence of God raised up a man for this work also. That unwearied friend of this cause, J. V. Himes, who has so nobly stood in the front of the hosts and the hottest of the fire, came forward and threw

himself into the enterprise, to make up the breach. On the 20th of March, 1840, without money, patrons, or scarcely friends, he issued the first number of the "SIGNS OF THE TIMES." The appearance of that sheet was hailed with joy by many a longing heart, waiting for the consolation of Israel. The paper was sustained for the first year at a considerable expense to the editor, besides his own unrequited toil.\* As might be expected, the enemies of the cause were greatly discommoded by the appearance of such a weapon, both offensive and defensive.—Nothing which a heart surcharged with gall could invent, or tongue of envy utter, was left unsaid or unwritten against the EDITOR. But his language was, None of these things move me. He was sufficiently convinced of the truth of the doctrine to know that it was worthy, at least, of a full and candid investigation, and this he determined it should have, so far as he was able to gain thus much for it." \* \* \*

"A few words respecting that faithful and devoted friend of the cause of Adventism, J. V. Himes, must close this part of the present work.

"From the position he has occupied in the front of the battle, the most deadly shafts of the enemy have been aimed at him. The generous spirit of self-sacrifice, with which he came forward and exerted every nerve for the advancement of this great work, excited at once the envy, the wrath, the anger, and calumny of the whole host of foes to the doctrine. And no means which could be devised to blast his influence have been wanting from that to the present time. But, through grace, he has thus far triumphed.

"From the commencement of his course as an advocate of this cause, the writer has been on terms of intimacy with him, and has known his whole course, and feels it to be a great pleasure to say, that a more noble-hearted, generous, and self-denying man never engaged in any enterprise. That the Advent book establishment has yielded profits which might have enriched him, is true; but that it has done this, is utterly false and groundless. The funds which have accrued from the sale of books, have been appropriated to the advancement of the work of God, the spreading of the glad tidings of his kingdom.

"The labors and fatigues he has endured in the work which has engrossed his attention, are too well known to require repetition here. No man can be found whose labors have been more abundant and arduous than his.

"When this work first began, it was a question of expediency whether the book business should be made public stock, or remain in his hands. Advisers were then few, and the decision was, that it would be best for the cause, produce less difficulty and strife, besides expediting the great object we had in view, to have it in the hands of some individual as his private property, to dispose of the whole as he had judged best. With the wisdom of that decision, the writer is more and more satisfied every successive day. That the funds could have been better appropriated, or indeed more satisfactorily, by any association or committee which could have been created, I do not believe.

"I believe the Providence of God raised up J. V. Himes as an associate and fellow-helper of Mr. Miller, in the great work of arousing the church and the world to prepare for the coming of the Lord; and that he has performed the work with fidelity to God and man, and honor to himself."

That Elder W. had read the above is evident from an article in the "Herald" of Sept. 29, 1849, entitled "Chardon-street Lectures No. 14, by J. P. Weethee," which is mostly made up from it, and much of the language copied without any credit to Bro. Litch, and in which he says: "'Signs of the Times' commenced March 20th. Without money, patrons, and with friends few and scattered, Mr. Himes began the publication of a paper with the title above named," &c.

Well, forgetting this, he commences the work of producing disaffection. When I received the first intimation of this, by the kind office of Bro. Pearson, I gave, in the "Herald" of May 18, the article entitled "More Secret Workings."

This article was thrown out to cause the movers in the plot to develop themselves. It has now produced the desired effect. On its appearance, Elder Weethee told Brn. Osler, Jones, and C. B. Turner, on board the steamboat Empire State, that he was the one referred to in it. Elder N. told Bro. Wetherbee, of Worcester, that that article meant him and Mr. Weethee. When they came to the Boston Conference the week following, they both denied that they had made any attempt on Mr. Himes' character, claimed to be persecuted by that article, and innocent of any imputations in it.—Bro. Mills told Bro. Osler that he knew that Mr. Weethee had not thought of hurting a hair of Bro. Himes' head; for he (W.) had told him so. Messrs. Weethee, Wood, Young, Hamblin, and others, whose names appear in the pamphlet,

\* He paid Dow & Jackson \$100 that year, besides his own labor, and the expenses of postage and editorial help in his absence.—Ed.

arose in the Conference and affirmed that they severally knew nothing against the character of Mr. Himes, as those present well remember. And Mr. Weethee's friends in the Chardon-street Church passed the following resolution, written by himself on the evening of June 20th:

"Whereas it is the duty of every Church to DEFEND the character of their pastor when assailed, that his instructions may be attended by the Divine blessing and heard without unwarranted prejudice; and whereas J. P. Weethee, who has been our pastor for the last year, came a stranger to labor with us, yet with a character UNBLEMISHED; and whereas he is now suffering (as he considers) under severe charges or accusations made against him by a member with us, and by the same circulated privately and in a very public manner through the columns of the Advent "Herald," of May 18th, thereby inflicting upon the same, in his estimation, a very serious injury; and whereas the aforesaid pastor has made known the same to the Church, requesting them to act in this matter as the defendants of his character:

"Therefore, Resolved, that in the opinion of this Church, the article in the "Advent Herald" of May 18th, headed "More Secret Workings," which appears over the signature of J. V. Himes, does contain CHARGES of a serious nature against some person or persons, and that there is sufficient evidence that the author of said article did consider J. P. Weethee, the Pastor of the Church aforesaid, as one of the principal persons therein intended."

On the falsity of the intimations in the aforesaid article they rested their plea for sympathy as the persecuted ones, and the wrongly accused. On that ground their present friends rallied around them, confessing at the time that should they see evidence of such a plot, they promptly should leave him. When the confession of Mr. Judson, that Mr. Himes' character was to be called in question, was stated by Bro. Osler in the Conference, Elders W. and N. both disavowed at the time any such thing—denying that it was any part of their arrangement. Elder W. stated in Church meeting, that previous to the New York Conference he had never written to any one, or told any one anything against the character of Mr. Himes. Now they come out in their pamphlet, and unblushingly show how they had been for weeks concerned in the very business they so strongly denied. The pamphlet itself is a sufficient proof of this. Other testimony is at hand. It being connected with the appointment of a committee by

#### THE CLASS FOR MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT.

it may be proper to refer to the origin of that Class. It was commenced with a request from Brn. Daniels, that a class be formed to receive instruction from Elder W. in those branches of study, with which from his former position he was presumed to be familiar. It is needless here to speak of the disappointment of the Class in the amount of instruction which he communicated. At its meeting on the 1st of April, it was thought inexpedient to continue its meetings through the summer. S. Bliss inquired whether the Class should adjourn *sine die*, or over to a given time. He did not make a motion to that effect, as is asserted on p. 17; but made the motion to meet at the call of its President when a suitable time should arrive, which was carried. At this meeting Messrs. Weethee, Judson, and Needham were appointed a committee, the design of which, with the opinion of the members of the Class respecting their duties, will appear by the following document:—

Boston, June 25th, 1850.

In obedience to a call for a meeting given in the "Herald" of the 22d, the following was signed by the members:—

"Whereas, at the last meeting of the CLASS FOR MUTUAL IMPROVEMENT, April 1st, 1850, it was adjourned to meet at the call of the President; and whereas a request for a meeting of the Class—signed by J. Pearson, Jr., L. Osler, W. Burnham, J. Daniels, G. H. Childs, S. Bliss, A. Hale, and O. R. Fassett—has been in the hands of the President since Tuesday evening the 4th inst.—put into his hands by Bro. S. Bliss, without the Class being yet called together; and whereas a meeting of the Class called in any other manner would be informal; therefore the Class can give no expression of opinion, as a Class, excepting in an individual manner. And further,

"Whereas, at the last meeting of the Class Brn. J. P. Weethee, L. P. Judson, and George Needham, were appointed a committee to consider the objects of this Class, and report to the Spring Conference the system of operations best adapted in their judgment to meet the exigencies of the case, and carry out the object of the Class. And,

"Whereas the only design of the Class is expressed on the records of its first meeting, Dec. 18th, 1849, as follows:—

"Our design is to gain a more thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, and to improve ourselves in those branches of knowledge which will enable us rightly to divide and illustrate the word of truth."



"Therefore we, individual members of the Class, disclaim having authorized said committee to take the oversight of any matters foreign to the above expressed object of the Class. And any other things which may have been the subject of their consideration, has been on their own responsibility, and not by authority or consent of the class, and are repudiated by us."

LEMUEL OSLER, JOHN PEARSON, JR.,  
O. R. FASSETT, W. BURNHAM,  
GEO. H. CHILD, SYLVESTER BLISS,  
A. HALE, J. F. GUILD,  
I. R. GATES, N. BILLINGS,  
E. GAGE, J. DANIELS,  
OLIVER D. EASTMAN.

Bro. Southard, whose name is on the list of members, was not present at the time of this meeting of the members of the class, and has had no opportunity to know their action. He doubtless would accede to the above. Besides him, Mr. Weethee's is the only name on the list of members not appended to the above.—Four or five other brethren were present at some of the meetings, and took a part as members, but through some neglect, never signed their names, or had them appended by the Secretary. Elder W. claims that he and Elder Judson, the originators of that committee, can tell better than the Class can, the design of the committee. They doubtless can—the appointment of that committee being a part of the projected arrangement, so as to get a show of acting by the authority of the Class. That deception is now revealed, and the Class unanimously throw back indignantly on the projectors of the plot all connection with it.

By virtue of this appointment that committee seem to have considered themselves invested with powers, which the Class repudiates, to arrange and remodel the entire polity of the Advent body. It was hoped that the whole of this plan would have come out in their pamphlet, but they seem to have had the discretion to reserve it. Mr. Weethee affirmed at the first meeting of the Conference in Boston that he had it all written out, and that it was presented only in part at the N. Y. Conference. From the part presented it appears to have been an approximation to the worst form\* of church organization. The part which was brought out at New York was to organize the churches, and then to have the Conferences, instead of being voluntary bodies, composed of delegates possessing "legislative power"† over the churches, who should have been the owners of a Conference paper, and should have appointed its conductors and editors. So much came out.—What was behind is in the dark. The Conference, it is evident, was to have possessed all the power of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church‡—though called a Conference. This would have shut out from our future deliberation, all who did not happen to be sent as delegates from some organized church; and to have shut them out was one part of the design.

Such a Conference, to have been empowered to hold property, to have performed any valid act for the transfer of property, would have been obliged to go to the state (to Cæsar) to obtain an "Act of Incorporation," without which no legal transfer of property can be made by a body. If not thus held it can only be held by individuals in trust. One of these forms must have been adopted. With such an organization, the

next work was to "lay Himes on the shelf," with his co-workers, and to put into their place those who coveted his position. The following documents will illustrate this.

J. V. HIMES.

The first tidings which came to hand is continued in the following statement of a conversation with Bro. John Pearson, Jr.

On Saturday, May 4th, Bro John Pearson, Jr., called at the "Herald" office and wished to make a few inquiries. Said he: "Did Bro. Edwin Burnham some time since preach here, and receive no pay?" Said Mr. Himes: "He preached here while I was at Homer, but having nothing to do with paying him, I cannot say as to his pay." Said Bro. Pearson: "Did you charge the Society for ten dollars paid to Bro. Burnham?" Ans.—"No." Quest.—"Has a regular entry been made of the Tract and Mission receipts and expenditures?" Ans.—"Yes, why do you inquire?" Because, said Bro. P., I have been told that you have charged the Society for ten dollars paid Bro. Burnham, which he never received, and have not kept an account of the funds of the Tract and Mission. Bro. P. also asked if there was any difficulty between Bro. H. and Bro. Weethee, or with the Society; or lack of confidence in his integrity, and if they were dissatisfied with his connection with the finances, or thought he controlled affairs too much? Bro. H. was ignorant of anything of the kind. Said Bro. P.: "When you went to New York, did you go off in a pet, saying that the Church cared nothing for you?" Question by Bro. Himes: "Who told you these things?" Ans.—"I am not at liberty to give any names; but hearing these things, I consulted my father, and by his advice have come directly to you to inform you of some things that have come to my knowledge, and get such explanation from you as would satisfy my mind. I farther learn that an effort of some nature (the particulars of which I am not fully acquainted with) is to be made against you at the New York Conference, if there is evidence that it could probably be carried." Bro. H. thanked him for his candor, told him that this was all new to him; he was not aware of any such movement, that it was new to him that he and Bro. W. had such disagreement; that Bro. W. had not communicated to him any grievance; that he had sustained Bro. W. with all the kindness and interest that he could have manifested for Father Miller; that he had no knowledge of Bro. Burnham's case; that if he had made any charge of that kind it would appear on the books of the Treasurer; that the records of the Tract and Mission fund, of which Bro. Bliss was Treasurer and alone responsible, would show for themselves, and that he would like the names of the originators of this. This Bro. P. could not give, and left him in the dark respecting them. Bro. P. then asked if he could have the privilege of examining the accounts of the Society, and the Tract and Mission fund: he wished to have his mind fully satisfied, and wanted those books for this purpose. Bro. Himes at once expressed his willingness to furnish every authority requested, which was accordingly done.

I hereby certify that the above statement respecting my conversation with Elder J. V. Himes is the substance of what was then said, and is as minute as I can now recall it. I also certify that I went to J. Emerson, the Treasurer, and examined the accounts of the Society, and found that Mr. Himes had made no charge and received no pay for money paid, or to be paid Bro. E. Burnham. I also examined the accounts of the Tract and Mission fund, item by item, and found that instead of money being retained by Mr. Himes, that the fund was credited \$100 from Mr. Himes; and also \$75 which had been received by him to put to any use he chose, with \$50 which he had not received, but for which a promissory note was given, and that for his own personal advantage, as Bro. J. White, the giver, testified afterwards before the Boston Conference—making \$225; and that in addition to this, the expenditures above the receipts left due the office \$165 30,—which Bro. H. afterwards subscribed to balance the account—making for the debits of the year \$735 24, with but \$344 94 received by the office for that object—the balance, \$390 30, having been given by the office without any obligation so to do. JOHN PEARSON, JR.

I hereby certify that the foregoing statement of conversation between Bro. Himes and Pearson, was in my presence, and is a faithful report according to my best recollection.

SYLVESTER BLISS.

I certify that Mr. Himes has made no charge to the Society, and has been allowed no money for payment to Bro. Edwin Burnham during the year past. JOHN EMERSON, [then Treas.]

The above conversation preceded and led to the article, "Secret Workings." The remarks of Elder W. with Bro. Burnham is thus given by him:

#### Testimony of Elder E. Burnham.

Brooklyn, Aug. 30th, 1850.

BRO. HIMES:—Yours was received this morning. Since matters have come to this pass, so far as I am concerned, the whole story must be told. At the time of the "confidential conversation" of which Mr. W. speaks, we were attending a series of meetings in Lowell. After an evening service, W. gave me to understand that he had some important matter to converse about with me. We therefore concluded to stop together over night. We soon opened a conversation in relation to you, as a public man, and the public affairs of the office. I gave him positively to understand that I was dissatisfied, as well as many others, in relation to matters touching the standing of the "Herald" and the office property, and wanted an explanation of matters. I thought, and said, as things stood, it was leading to a system of Popery! I spoke very strongly to him, because I then thought him your friend, and the friend of the cause. On account of the peculiar situation of things in Boston, I advised him to take charge of the congregation independent of yourself—as a stranger would. I thought he and the people would do better so. He wished me to give him a history of things in Boston from the beginning, which I did, and I think impartially. As I supposed him honest and good, I spoke freely of both sides, blaming you where I thought you ought to be blamed, but closed with informing him, that notwithstanding your foibles and mistakes, I thought you honest and sincere. Now, all this was about public matters, and not private character. So far, "the conversation was mutual;" but will Mr. Weethee contend it was any farther?

In addition to the above, Mr. Weethee stated that he could not tell what became of the money sent to the office for the Tract and Mission Fund. I tried to account for it. He said no;—he had seen dark things at the office,—that he was suspicious of your honesty,—that you had treated Marshall wrong,—that you had spoken to him (Marshall) abruptly when you dismissed him,—that he did not get treated well at your house, sometimes getting no supper after his work was done, &c., and many other things calculated to make me think you a wicked man. Still, I did not dream of any plot against you; but what to think I could not tell. My own suspicions began to be aroused; I doubted whether you were sincere in offering the Conference the management of the "Herald," and I think I expressed my doubts to W.—What could I do? Weethee did not tell me he wished this kept from you, and why, then, does he complain? I told him I should see Pearson, and talk with him. He urged me to do so! and now complains of Bro. P. He did not tell me to charge P. with secrecy, nor did I thus charge him. I was willing Bro. Himes should know it all, but concluded, as the matters about which I complained were public matters, it would all come up in the Conference.

The next time you met me, you saw a change in me,—I was not as cordial as I usually was. You asked me what was the matter? I made no direct answer, but soon found that you knew all about matters from Bro. Pearson. This was before I told you a word. I then told you what made me feel so;—I wanted to know how things were. You explained about the \$10,\* and other things, so that I felt better. This was at New York, during the Conference. Up to this time I suspected no plot on the part of W. and N., nor did I intend to convey to you at New York the least idea of a plot. I have heretofore doubted the propriety of that article—"Secret Workings"—but how can I now doubt it?

Now, if in all of this matter I have "abused confidence, or done wrong, I repent: only let it be shown wherein.

In relation to the Pamphlet, there is only one thing in particular that troubles me, and that is the commendatory letter of Elder J. Turner's memory. But you will, of course, fix that matter right.†

EDWIN BURNHAM.

On p. 21, Elder W. says of this: "If Eld. E. Burnham has abused confidence, and prejudiced Mr. Himes' mind, all I have to say is, that if such a course is pursued—if all our confidential conversation is to be carried to one person, we had as well have the inquisition at once. We shall soon be as Rome was in the days of Tiberias Cæsar. This abuse of confidence would ruin all social and religious order, and bring ruin on those carrying out the practice."

It will be remarked, that what Elder W. has attempted to collect, has been just such private conversation. Whether he is involved in the ruin predicted in the pursuit of such a course, will be developed in the future.

#### Attempt to Prejudice Elder J. Cummings.

Before this, an attempt was made to prejudice the mind of Elder Cummings. He writes:—

Barnston (N. H.), Aug. 1st, 1850.

BRO. HIMES:—The movements of some professed brethren of late towards you, have been, and are still, more and more disgusting to me; and as an act of justice to you, I think duty demands that I should state the facts in relation to a conversation I had with Elder J. P. Weethee, some time in March last, at Bro. Lang's house in Boston. He (W.) has told that I was dissatisfied, giving a wrong impression to some brethren in relation to what I said, and I therefore wish to set the matter right.

In the course of the conversation I remarked that I was sorry to see advertisements of medicines, &c., in the "Herald," and that I feared the article to "Agents and Correspondents" might prevent some of the unlearned from doing what they could. I never intimated that I had ever written for the "Herald," and my communications had been shut out, as has been reported by Elder W. (and here I wish to say, that every letter I ever wrote to you, with the least expectation of its being published, has been). Elder Weethee said the "Herald" could not stand it long without a change in something. He said the whole concern came near falling through last summer; that you came home from some tour (I do not

\* Elder W. had affected Bro. Burnham's mind by stating to him, that I had charged the Society for \$10 paid Eld. B., which had not been paid him.—Ed.

† Shall attend to that in the proper place.

recollect what one), and there was so much dissatisfaction that you was discouraged, and so much mismanagement, that the vessel was about to sink; and that all that saved the "Herald" and the cause was, the tract, "The last Hour—Our Specific Work," (which he (W.) had written,) which, when he saw the condition the cause was in, he brought forward, had it published, and thus saved the cause for that time. He thought that those who differed from the "Herald" in faith were not well treated by it; yet what was said in the "Herald" in relation to them was in a sort of covered up manner, so as to keep their influence and support. The Tract and Mission Fund, he said, was all managed by one mind, and was worse than Popery! Something was said in regard to some other one taking the place of Bro. Bliss. He thought some one should, but did not say who. I, however, thought, if things were in such a state as he had represented, and from the exalted opinion I had of him, that he might satisfy the Adventists better than Bro. Bliss—not that I thought or could believe that Bro. Bliss was dishonest, or a bad man, or anything of the kind. It was with me merely a matter of opinion, that Elder Weethee would suit better than Bro. Bliss. I never had such a mind until that conversation. I am now satisfied that I was deceived in him and by him.

The above is the amount of the conversation. It made a deep impression on my mind, unfavorable to your and Bro. Bliss' management, but which is now all removed. What has transpired since that conversation has given me perfect confidence in your honesty and ability to manage. I say, Let us have the old hands, until somebody shows by their works, and not by their words, that they can do a great deal better.

J. CUMMINGS.

#### Attempt to Prejudice Elder W. Burnham.

Exeter (N. H.), June 28th, 1850.

BRO. BLISS:—The following is the substance of what Bro. Weethee said to me concerning the "Herald," yourself, and matters connected with Chardon-street Church. He said that the "Herald" ought to be the property of the Adventists; \* that it ought to be under the control of a committee appointed by the Conference. He said something in regard to yourself very much like the following: That you manifest but little or no interest in the meetings at Chardon-street Chapel; that you did not attend there, but a Congregational meeting; that you was not, therefore, a proper person to occupy the place which you fill in the office. I have an impression that this was not all he said concerning you, but it is all that I can distinctly recollect; and I think it is the amount of what was said.

He also said, that Bro. Himes had the sole and entire control of all temporal matters, or affairs, connected with the Chardon-street Chapel. All money, he said, raised by collections, or otherwise, went into his hands, and that he used it as he saw fit.† This was the reason, he said, why some brethren who did not attend the Chardon-street meetings, would not come and unite with them: they could not, or would not, while he thus had the control, &c. He said he did not receive one cent for his services for nine weeks after coming to Boston.‡

Yours, &c.

WESLEY BURNHAM.

The foregoing will show the work in which Elder W. was engaged. The connection of the "Committee" with that work now begins to appear.

#### Testimony of Elder L. Osler.

Salem (Mass.), Aug. 30th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. HIMES:—I testify that the following conversation, in substance, was had in my house between Elder L. P. Judson and myself a short time before the New York Conference. Elder J. had come to this place, from Boston, directly from the sitting of the committee. He knew that I had anticipated an absence from home of six weeks after the New York Conference, and did not intend to be present at the Boston Conference; and hence he said that I would not pay my intended visit, because there would be developments made at the New York Conference which would astonish me, and cause me to decide to be at the Boston Conference; that the developments related to Bro. Himes' moral character; that Elders Weethee and Needham had in their possession facts in relation to Himes' moral character, which, if true, would ruin him (Himes) forever. I asked him if Elders W. and N. had not told Bro. Himes these things? He answered, No. I asked if they were not going to? He said, Not at present. They were communicating with brethren abroad, and receiving communications, and they intended to wait until a "proper time," and then Elder W. would go to Elder Himes and reveal the facts. When Elder Himes was to be apprized of these things, these questions were to be asked him: "Does the 'Advent Herald' belong to you, or the cause?" If he should say, "To the cause," then Elder H. was to be required to give an account of his stewardship. If he should say, "The paper belongs to me,"—then another paper, belonging to the cause, was to be started, and then the things against his (Himes') moral character were to be brought to the light.—Elder Judson further stated, that this committee, appointed by the Mutual Class, had considered the affairs connected with the Advent office, and had arrived at the following conclusion: That Elder Himes must have made about \$6000 a-year clear by the "Herald," the last ten years. (Elder J., in a recent communication to me, says I misunderstood on "this point." "I intended," he says, "to communicate this idea—That several of us had made as close es-

\* He knew that it was Mr. Himes' property, then, as early as this conversation; but told Bro. Osler, Jones, and C. B. Turner, subsequently, that had he known that, he should not have meddled with it.—Ed.

† All money raised by collection, or otherwise, went into the hands of Bro. Emerson, the Treasurer. Elder W. had had his pay for those services before making this statement, which was some time before the New York Conference, and before I knew of the secret workings.—Ed.

‡ Professional men in Boston get their salary at the end of each quarter. Elder W. had his pay for those weeks before the end of the quarter.—Ed.

\* Cumberland Presbyterianism is the body to which Mr. Weethee belonged. This body do not require a collegiate course for their ministers, and dissent from some of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. "The men, it is said, who founded it, were under synodical censure, sanctioned by the action of the General Assembly."—Hist. of the Cumb. Pres. Ch., by Rev. H. S. Porter, one of its ministers, who goes on to show that that is no objection, because "Wesley, censured and excommunicated, established the Methodist church." Mr. Wesley never was disconnected from the Church of England, but died in full fellowship. In Presbyterian churches "the pastor, or pastors, and the ruling elders, compose the church session. To this body is confided the spiritual government of the congregation; for which purpose, they have power to inquire into the knowledge and Christian conduct of the members of the church; to call before them offenders and witnesses; to receive members into the church; to admonish, to rebuke, to suspend, or exclude from the sacraments those who are found to deserve censure; to concert the best measures for promoting the spiritual interests of the congregation; and to appoint delegates to the presbytery and the synod. Appeals may be made from their decisions, to the presbytery, and carried up to the higher judicatories."

"The General Assembly is the highest judicatory of the Presbyterian Church. It represents in one body all the particular churches of this denomination, and constitutes the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence, among all our churches. It consists of an equal delegation of bishops and elders from each presbytery."—Hist. of all Den. in U. S., pp. 464-5.

† Mr. Weethee admitted this before the Boston Conference.

‡ The officers of a church, sitting in judgment on a question which should come before the whole church, would be a very good substitute for the "bench of ruling elders," which in the Presbyterian Church decides questions which in New England churches come before all the members.



timates as we well could of the profits, and that we, *these several individuals, meaning not the members of the committee exclusively*, had ascertained that the net profits must be from three to five thousand dollars per annum, and that my opinion was, that it was nearer six thousand than three—including the profits of the book and tract publishing establishment, and what was donated to the cause and to Bro. Himes on his excursions.") He further stated, that communications from various quarters, received by Elder Weethee, expressed dissatisfaction with the present management of the "Herald" office, and the request was for reform; that these things were to be kept "secret" from all save a few "confidential" brethren.

I state these things in the fear of God, believing that every statement is substantially correct. (These statements I made at the May Conference in Boston, in the presence of Elders Weethee and Needham.)

LEMUEL OSLER.

When the above testimony was given in the Conference by Elder Osler, the brethren well remember how stoutly Elders W. and N. denied that an attack on the moral character of Elder Himes had formed any part of their plan; their declaration that if Mr. Judson had made these statements, he had made them entirely on his own responsibility, and that they were not to be identified with them.

When Elder N. took the ground, that there were charges to be investigated, he affirmed in the presence of the Conference, that they came from Chardon-st. Chapel. When the members of that Church were requested to rise, and state if they knew of any such charges, Elder W., his wife, M. Wood, J. G. Hamblin, J. W. Young, and others, arose, and affirmed their ignorance of any such.

Elder Osler, having conversation with some of them, testifies as follows:

J. G. Hamblin, of East Boston, told me during the sitting of the last May Conference in Boston, and in the presence of Samuel Mills, of East Boston, that he knew nothing against Elder Himes' moral or Christian character. That he had known Elder H. a long time, and had heard a great deal against him, but that he had yet to learn the first thing which could be justly sustained against him. These remarks were made in reply to a question I put to him, whether any charges had then been made to him against Elder H., as he was one appointed to receive them.

I further testify, that M. Wood, of Boston, told me, in his own house, and in the presence of Elders I. R. Gates and J. Daniels, that the charges preferred against Elder Himes by Elder N. were not believed by the Chardon-street Church. He further stated, that if Elders Himes and Weethee would be reconciled to each other, there would be no farther difficulty.

And further: Bro. Samuel Mills, of East Boston, told me, that Elder Weethee told him, that he (W.) never intended to injure a hair of Bro. Himes' head,—that it was farthest from his thoughts to do him an injury, and that he had never said or done anything to injure him.

LEMUEL OSLER.

I recollect the above statement of M. Wood, that the Chardon-st. Church did not believe the charges.

J. DANIELS.

Elder W. makes a different impression on the mind of Dea. West, who thus testifies:

Boston, June 24th, 1850.

This certifies, that in a conversation respecting the article entitled "Secret Workings," with Elder J. P. Weethee, on Saturday, May 25th, after the Conference in Boston in May ult., he told me that Mr. Himes was to have been kept ignorant of the plan till it was accomplished; that he was told, that if Mr. Himes knew of it he would defeat it; and that he was advised, if they could not accomplish it otherwise, to bring accusations against Mr. Himes' moral character.

J. W. WEST.

That there was a design to make an attack at the New York meeting, is also evident from the following extract from a letter received by Bro. Sisson, of Providence, R. I., dated "Boston, April 16, 1850." The *hand and italics* are copied from the letter:

"*Momentous interests are coming up in the New York Conference. I can explain nothing farther at present. Things are favorable, and God is directing the cause. All will be well. If anything is said by brethren in Providence, who differ in opinion on certain points, ask them to please defer all matters of discussion until I see them, which will probably be next Sabbath. Bro. Weethee and Bro. Needham are both engaged, and cannot come at present. Please urge brethren to hold all matters in which they differ in opinion perfectly quiet until I come. Love to all.*"

L. P. JUDSON.

This view is confirmed by the following letters from Providence:

Letter from Sister Sisson,

Providence, June 25th, 1850.

MY DEAR BRETHREN IN THE LORD:—It is truly painful to me to write the following; but if the cause demands it, I will write. Bro. L. P. Judson stopped with us in Providence. His gay and lively appearance, for a minister, tried us very much. Among other things, he spoke of Bro. Himes, of the "Herald," and office affairs, and said that they were going to look into these things; that they wanted to know whether they were Bro. H.'s property, or not; that it belonged to the Advent cause. He also said, that as near as they could estimate, they had supposed Bro. Himes to be worth \$15,000; that they had examined some books, and found that money had been paid in which had not been charged; that a woman had paid \$40, and nothing said about it. He related the particulars of his visit East, and spoke of a disposition on the part of Bro. Himes to pocket money that had been given him where he had preached. He said, that if the "Herald" belonged to Bro. Himes, they would start a new paper of their own; and asked if all the brethren at the Conference rise up against Bro. H., what could he do? He mentioned the names of some brethren who were engaged with him. He said that the subject was so momentous, that he was pushed forward to bear the brunt of the battle, as he was soon to go away, &c. He also spoke of the committee of three. The next time he came to our house, after a meeting of the committee, he said that

everything was arranged for the Conference. He also spoke of the Missionary Fund, saying that a correct report had not been given of it. It is not necessary for me to say more, as the same things that were communicated to Elder Osler were told us.

M. SISSON.

Letter from Bro. A. Pierce.

Providence, June 25th, 1850.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:—L. P. Judson stated to me on Friday evening, April 19th last, that there were some things of tremendous interest to be brought up at the Conference to be held in New York city, and that some prominent actor in the Advent cause was implicated; he did not mention who it was, but said, "Cease ye from man," and, "I don't know who we can trust." He afterwards stated, that the Church in Boston was about to disengage itself from the "Herald" office, and not to be controlled in any way by Bro. Himes. Some conversation besides passed between us, but this is all that was said to me that has an important bearing on the case of Bro. Himes.

ANTHONY PIERCE.

Another letter was received by Bro. Sisson from Elder Judson, dated Jamestown, June, 1850, in which he says:

"The LEADING points I set out in the CAMPAIGN to accomplish are—1st. To whom does the 'Herald' and the profits of the office belong? To J. V. Himes individually? or to the brethren of the cause generally? That question settled, if Bro. H. says it is his, and he shall keep it—having the legal power to do so—it of course settles that question. His Church will then have to deal with him for hypocritical and dishonest pretensions, and professing that the 'Herald' belonged to the cause, and was under the direction of brethren in Conference, when he did not intend it. If he says it belongs to the cause, and is under the control of brethren in Conference, then I want a publishing committee to take charge of it, and appoint their publishing agent: it may be him, or any one else—as committee might think best—and that committee will inquire after the net profits of the office for eight or ten years past, and see that they are put into the hands of a missionary committee, to be appropriated by them to further the cause." \* \* \*

"I entered upon the work of effecting a reform in these and some other matters, with a view of *accomplishing* it. I expect to continue efforts steadily until it is effected. I expect some will get mad, and perhaps rave—and others will misunderstand; but that will make no difference with me."

In a letter to Bro. Fassett, dated Jamestown, July 21st, 1850, Elder Judson says:—

"Now, suppose this matter had taken a regular business course, according to my understanding of the design of the committee, who could have been wronged or harmed? When we arrived at N. Y., we should have stated to the Conference that such a committee were appointed by the Class, and that we had matters to propose, or a communication to make. The Conference, either with or without reading, would have referred it to their business committee, and they have reported it, or not, as they saw fit.—Now, I am not after the merits of the question, I am after the question, whether the Class committee were *out of order* in the course they took."

"Another fact. As some of the reasons for a change in the 'Herald' office would involve Bro. Himes' integrity, I understood the proposition to be, that while the general business of the Conference was being attended to, of the missionary labor and funds, organization, arrangements, resolutions, &c. &c., with some few confidential and judicious brethren, we would have an interview with Bro. Himes, and see if matters could not be so arranged as to save a public statement of that part of the reasons, if not the whole, and then act according to the results of that interview."

"You will not consider this, or any other communication from me, on this subject, confidential. Please show it to *all* the friends, and especially to Bro. J. V. H."

The same work was also being done at New York.

Letter from Bro. and Sister Warner.

Bro. Warner writes:—

New York, June 4th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. HIMES:—As near as Mrs. Warner can recollect, Mrs. Weethee [while stopping there during the New York Conference] let fall some words about money obtained (as she had heard) by Bro. Himes from a colored family. My wife replied, that that affair had been investigated, and proved to be a groundless charge. "Ah!" said Sister Weethee, "but how was it investigated? It has been ascertained since that Bro. Himes obtained the money from the *wife* of the colored man." This is as near as my wife can recollect. At all events, the impression left on the mind of my wife was this: that Sister Weethee believed that you received the money, and that the affair was plastered over, no honest investigation having taken place. It is plain that Bro. Weethee and wife have rather hostile feelings towards you, or had at the time they were here. . . . Yours, in unwavering confidence,

A. K. WARNER.

In another letter, dated June 15th, Bro. Warner again writes: "He (Weethee) stated [to Bro. Warner] that he had always supposed the 'Advent Herald' was the property of the Advent cause, and could be claimed by them on their paying you what funds you might have invested in it belonging to you. I said to him that I had taken the paper from the first week of its existence, and should as soon suppose the Advent cause had a just claim to the coat you wore as to the 'Advent Herald,' books, press, or anything thereunto appertaining. He also stated, that a reputable person stated to him (Weethee) that Himes had cheated him out of \$2000. Weethee added, that he did not know whether the person's statement was true or not."

Mrs. Warner writes as follows:—

New York, June 15th, 1850.

BRO. HIMES:—Mr. Weethee did not make direct charges against you; but threw out hints and insinuations in general terms. I will give his remarks in his own words, as near as I can recollect. He said that things were wrong in the "Herald" office; a

thorough investigation should be had, and things brought out to the light—no longer plastered over. Said he, "Himes has no influence in Boston; they have no confidence in him there; nothing could be done when Himes' name was attached." He (Weethee) had seen things in the "Herald" office that astonished him. He had, however, struggled to keep down his suspicions, until he could no longer resist his convictions, that Bro. Himes had been guilty of wrong-doing. I asked Weethee: "Have you been to Bro. Himes, and asked an explanation of what to you appeared so suspicious and wrong?" He replied, "I have talked some with him." From Weethee's conversation I gathered this: That he believed Bro. Himes was enriching himself out of the Advent people; was pretending to make sacrifice for the good of the cause, when at the same time he was prospering in a worldly point more than he had ever done before. The remarks by Mr. Weethee above-named occurred during the Conference, in May last, in this city.

ELIZABETH WARNER.

The above, be it remembered, transpired before the time when Elder W. had not had a thought of injuring a "hair of Bro. Himes' head!"

Conversation of Bro. I. E. Jones and D. I. Robinson with Elder Weethee.

On the occasion of Bro. Jones and calling on him at Bro. Lang's, we both told him we called to see if something could not be done to settle matters, and stop publishing them in the "Herald;" that unless he should enter into some definite arrangements to settle by committee or council, or his retraction of those slanderous reports, the article prepared would be published. We both told him wherein we thought him wrong in giving ear to these rumors, and in telling them to others without once speaking to you, (Bro. Himes,) when he had daily opportunity, and was a brother and Pastor in the same church; that if he had done it, the trouble would not have arisen—if he would acknowledge the wrong, it could be at once settled. He said these things had made an impression on his mind, and he could not say he was satisfied; that they came from brethren, and were told to him so credibly, and other things, too, besides those charges, that he must have time and a thorough examination; and if they were not true, *on this church be the responsibility*; "yes, I say, on this church be the responsibility." We asked him to tell us who they were that had told him, and why he had not revealed their names, as that would have cleared himself, and furnished the means of investigating the matter? He said that he did not feel at liberty *now*, to tell us, but at the proper time and tribunal, when it should come before the Church, or committee, he would tell *out all, everything just as it was, and who told him*, and if the things were not true, on them be the responsibility.

The above is the substance of what was said, and mostly in the very phraseology used by him.

D. I. ROBINSON.

Interview of Bro. D. I. Robinson with Elder Weethee.

After the session of the Conference closed, I stopped and conversed with him over an hour. I told him I thought him wrong in going about, and hearing and telling these "reports" about a brother, and a minister of the same church, as he had at Lowell, New York, Worcester, and Syracuse, with whom he had, or could have had, almost daily interviews, without ever going to him, and asking him if they were so, and giving him opportunity to clear himself, or acknowledge the fault, and show satisfactory repentance and reformation, which was enjoined in Matt. 5: 23 and 18: 15. He justified himself on the ground of its "confidential and fire-side character," which was not meant, in those scriptures, to be condemned. I said that was the very way that scandal and mischief were always circulated, and if they did not cover such, they did not meet the worst of the cases. He also took the ground that the matters were public, and those rules not binding. I replied, if it amounted to "ought against his brother" in his mind, they were binding; and if not, then he should not have "ought" to report, or to say, against his brother. He said "we differed in opinion." I then proposed "a committee" to be appointed by the Conference, or agreed upon by themselves, to whom this matter would be referred, and by whose decision the parties would abide. He said that was just what he would like; he had thought of it himself, and wished it might be done; but he thought Bro. H. would not agree to it. I told him I could vouch for you, from my knowledge of you, that you would, and if he said so, I would go and see, and the committee could be fixed on that night, and all could be settled on the morrow, and all the brethren's feelings relieved, and the cause saved. He said he could, and would, on one condition,—that was, I, and perhaps the brethren, differed from him on the application of those passages to such cases. If the committee should do so, he would submit, provided they applied them equally to both, under like circumstances. I said that was fair, and should be understood. He said H. would not agree to it; and he did not think Himes, Hale, and Bliss would overlook it, so as to feel well to him, if he did. I said he need not fear that; that H. had often done so to others, and his brethren charged as a fault, that he was too ready to forgive. But I had not said a word to him, but would go and see; but I wanted it understood, that Bro. Himes, Hale, Bliss, and the brethren generally, thought him wrong in the course he had taken, (we would not require him to confess that he had taken it intentionally,) and would expect him to confess that it was taken carelessly and unfortunately, and would want him to admit that it was unbrotherly to try to remove the "Herald" from him, without a word being said to Bro. H., and to report such charges behind his back, without knowing their truth, or saying a word to him. If he would take these back, admitting the error, without impugning his motives, all could be settled, and all feel well towards him, if he would take hold, and labor in harmony and confidence. He said he would do it, if the committee applied principles impartially. I told him, of course they ought to, and would; and I would go at once and see Bro. H., and have it arranged, and all adjusted to-morrow. He said I might, for he wanted it settled, and something *must* be done;

for he could not labor so. He should retire from the ministry. I then started for Charlestown, having but thirty minutes to the evening session, found Bro. H., stated the proposition plainly and fully, and asked him if he would accept it? He said, "Yes, with all my heart!" I stated Elder W.'s fear that he (Bro. H.) and the brethren would not overlook his (W.'s) difference of opinion. He said: "Yes, we will; he need have no fear of that; he shall find in me a man and a brother!" I afterwards stated the same things to Bro. Hale and Bliss, and they said the same,—they would agree to that, and be satisfied.

He (W.) came not to the evening session. I told the Conference I had hopes of daylight on the subject before to-morrow, and wished all should be present then. I also said, that from interviews I had had with both parties, I hoped we should all go home rejoicing that the matter was settled.

That night and the next morning, W. fell in with other counsellors, and when I saw him in Conference, and asked him if he was ready to fulfil his agreement of the previous night, he said, No—he thought not. I asked why, and said that Bro. Himes was willing, and had accepted it; and if he was willing to abide by the agreement, all could be settled that day. He said his friends advised him not to. I told him I was sorry, and asked him to go out with me and talk it over, and see if there was not some way to settle it, but he refused. I left him, but in half an hour, feeling so bad, I went to him again, and begged him, for God's sake—for the cause' sake—for his own sake—for Bro. Himes' sake, and the brethren's sake, to go and see if there could not be some way to settle this matter. He sighed, and said he did not know what to do. I then asked him to come with me, and see if we could not find out what to do. We went into the vestry, and talked half an hour. During the conversation, he said he had not had a shadow of doubt of your honesty till the 25th of February; that these things came from members of Chardon-street Church; that they had made an impression on his mind; first one had told him a thing, of which he thought but little, but it left an impression; another tells him something, but he does not think it worth minding; again he hears something,—pauses, and thinks, What does this mean? possibly there may be something in it, till he concludes that there *must* be something, and that he will speak to some one about it, &c. He also said, that the Church was responsible for it, and if it turned out untrue, he would make full acknowledgments and reparation, but could not leave it to anybody now. I expressed my sorrow, and said that he could, if he would, take his own course; that he could destroy himself, injure Bro. Himes, dishonor and wound the cause, but he would find, after all, it might have been arranged and settled there. The above, with the exception of his retiring from the ministry, I stated before the Council, and also to him the same day before many witnesses, when he did not deny its truth, but said he did not recollect.

D. I. ROBINSON.

Interview of Bro. I. E. Jones.

Brooklyn (N. Y.), July 1st, 1850.

BRO. HIMES:—You request a detailed statement of the conversation which I had with Elder Weethee after my return from Providence, in view of a harmonious settlement, to prevent the "statement of personal affairs" from appearing in the "Herald."

I called on Elder W., and informed him that you was ready to meet him, and proposed that he should take one, two, or three friends of his choice, and have an interview with him. He declined, saying, that a committee had been appointed to investigate things; and, moreover, that Bro. Hamblin knew everything in the case,—his every thought and feeling, as well as himself,—and he had conversed with Bro. Himes the day previous, which would be all the same as if he were to do so himself. He further stated—1. That the committee of the Class for Mutual Improvement had surveyed and examined the whole field—its wants—the men—their different talents, adaptation to different stations, &c.

2d. If this had been kept private, and carried out as it was designed that it should be, it would have been different now; that had it not been for that *cross vein* that struck Pearson, it would all have been carried through at the New York Conference, and things would have been very different from what they now were. But Pearson's doing as he did defeated the whole affair.

3d. There were several things about Bro. Himes and the office which needed investigation; if they were not true, he would be willing to retract all that he had said and done about them; that a good many could not labor as things now are,—till they were cleared up; that if these things were not investigated and cleared up, he should have to leave the field, for he could not labor as things now were.

4th. The charge in which he was concerned he cared nothing about,—had nothing to do in pressing it, and it would not be considered anything if the others were cleared up.

5th. That he would submit the case to a regular committee of brethren; and if they would apply the principle equally, he would abide their decision.

6th. If the piece headed "Secret Workings" had not come out in the "Herald," it could all have been settled at once between the parties.

7th. That, at the proper time, he should make a full statement of the whole matter, as far as he was concerned; had been preparing such a statement, &c.

8th. The reason he did not investigate the reports against Bro. Himes before reporting them at New York, was, he heard them but just before leaving for that city.

In reply to the inquiry—"Which of those reports are you not satisfied is wholly unfounded?" he said:

1st. The case relating to Bro. Burnham needs investigating. I asked him if he did not invite Bro. Burnham to Boston, and if you were not at Homer at the time he came? He answered, Yes. What, then, could Bro. Himes have to do with it? I asked. He replied, Well, it needs investigating. Why—how? If Bro. Himes was at Homer at the time, and had no charge on his books against the Church for that Sabbath, how could he have had anything to do with it? He answered, Well, I do not know; but these things all need to be investigated; and if they are made clear I shall be satisfied. I said that he



greatly surprised me, for I could not see how he could avoid being satisfied in that case, at least.

2d. He could not say but the account of the Tract and Mission Fund was right, but as it stands, Bro. Hale received \$12 while at work on the "Harp." I inquired if he was not satisfied it was right when he presented the auditor's report in Conference? He said he was not. I expressed my great surprise at this, told him I had not investigated that account only because I understood (as I was quite sure all did) that he was satisfied with it, and asked why he did not state his dissatisfaction in Conference, when he made the report? He replied, that that was no place for such a statement; that there was such a surge of feeling there that it would have doomed everything. I assured him that that "surge of feeling" was raised because Elder N. had objected to passing a vote of approbation of the "Herald," because rumors were afloat respecting you, and that the Conference had waited twenty-four hours for some one to come forward and present charges against you, or become responsible that they should be presented to the church at a future time, without any one doing so; that such a proceeding could not fail to awaken the deepest indignation in every unbiased mind; for, whatever was the design, it looked like a design to keep you under a cloud.

3d. The case of the black woman may be right, but there is such a thing as whitewashing a matter all over, to make it look very different from what it really is.

4th. The statements which Bro. Himes made in Court respecting the "Herald" property, if he was correctly informed, did not agree with what he now claims.

5th. That at one time, he pointed to his name being on the "Herald" as publisher only, as proof that he was only agent for the cause; and to Elder Marsh's being on the "Harbinger" as editor and proprietor.

6th. That he always understood, till he came East, that the "Herald" was Conference property; and was greatly surprised to learn to the contrary. This affair needed straightening.

7th. He had all these things from persons right about here (Boston), who had lived here a long time, and known Bro. Himes, and it was very strange that so much should be said if there was no truth in it.

8th. He could not be supposed to be Bro. Himes' enemy, for he came here wholly on the strength of a letter from him, which promised him a support if he came.

9th. The reason he attempted the proposed changes secretly was, that persons much better acquainted with things than himself, told him the effort would be defeated if he did not. He had proposed to talk with Bro. Himes about the matter, and communicate through the paper respecting it, but was told it would not do.

10th. The reason he did not state any of these objections in Conference was, there was such a surge against them by the *lawyer twist* that had been taken, that it was not a proper place; and he chose to make the statement at another time and place. I. E. J.

#### Interview of Bro. Merchant.

New York, Sept. 2d, 1850.

DEAR BRO. HIMES:—If Mr. Weethee's book is not more correct elsewhere than in pp. 47 and 48—where my name is mentioned, its statements are not entitled to any confidence whatever. In the pages referred to, the inference is forced upon the reader, that Mr. Weethee was under the "impression" all of Wednesday forenoon, that Conference was awaiting the result of our negotiations. *This is not so:* both Weethee and Needham knew that our efforts to procure an amicable arrangement was based *alone* on our desire for peace to the Church,—that it was an individual effort. We had no authority from Conference to so act, nor was that body in any way responsible for what we did or did not do. This in substance both Bro. C. B. Turner and myself told them at the time.

Another inference there drawn is, that our efforts at an arrangement were broken off because Bro. Turner and myself said, you would not withdraw the article called "Secret Workings." *This also is incorrect.* Weethee and Needham agreed to accept your proposition as a basis of settlement, provided you would publish the decision of the Council that should have charge of the subject in the "Herald." This you readily assented to; but when this assent was announced to W. and N., they refused to abide by their former agreement, unless the Council was broken up. Of course we had no control over the Council and being fully convinced, on my part, from the conversation and conduct of Weethee, that they desired *no amicable arrangement of the matter*, I left them.

Another inference is, that Weethee, by the duplicity of Conference, or of Bro. T. and myself, or of all three, was designedly or unnecessarily kept out of Conference all of Wednesday forenoon, during which time Conference was pressing the investigation of the charges against you to a hasty decision in your favor. This appears to me to be *wickedly and designedly false.* Mr. Weethee knows that I presented your proposition to him about 8 o'clock that morning, couched in terms so just and equitable, and in language so simple and unambiguous, that *no man honestly desiring peace* could hesitate five minutes to accept it. If they chose to higgie away the time in order to gain some advantage over you, let them say so, and not charge it to the negotiations. I WAS NOT IN THE VESTRY ONE HOUR DURING THE FORENOON.

I might say more, but I suppose this will suffice to justify my opening paragraph. All whom I have conversed with, (and there are several,) whose names are mentioned in the book, complain of the same thing, viz., that in narrating what relates to them, the truth is pushed out by untruthful inferences. In fact, the book appears to be compiled of sneers and false inferences.

Yours sincerely,  
CHARLES MERCHANT, 174 Delancy-st.

#### Interview of Bro. C. B. Turner.

New York, Aug. 31st, 1850.

BRO. HIMES:—Yours of the 29th was received.

\* Received while taking care of his sick family at home, leaving Bro. B. to do the work on the Harp.

As to "the pamphlet," I see nothing in it that demands special notice from me at present, except to give a more full account, on some points, of the matter referred to on pp. 47, 48.

At my request, Bro. Merchant went with me to visit Bro. Weethee. My reasons were these: I loved the cause, and could not willingly see one, whose services I deemed so important to its interest, lost to the cause without the last possible effort to save them; nor to see the cause distracted by them. Another reason was, my deep regard for Bro. Weethee himself; for there was, perhaps, no person in whom I felt a deeper interest. I had spent much time with him at Cincinnati; had been with him at Philadelphia; and I think, at all his visits and labors at New York I have been here, and much of the time with him, by day and by night. During his labors here last winter, I labored with him from house to house, and much of the time lodged with him. My heart, and all the feelings within me, were interested; and in the "voluntary mediation," I went to him with the deepest feelings of affectionate regard. I left him with feelings of the deepest anguish that ever wrung my heart. And even while I write, it is as Brutus says, "Not that I love Cæsar less, but Rome (the cause) more."

The objections raised by Bro. Weethee to settlement by mutual council were these: 1st. Bro. Himes had published his own side of the case while his had not been presented. 2d. The article in the "Herald," entitled, "More Secret Workings" (by-the-by, when that article left my room, in Brooklyn, for Boston, I had never heard the name of Bro. Weethee associated with any such movements). 3d. Conscientious scruples to such a council.

After some conversation as to the propriety of his first objection, it was no longer urged. He was informed that his request for the withdrawal of the article referred to, would not, under existing circumstances, be presented to Bro. Himes, but that it would come under the direction of the council, and be withdrawn if they ordered it done, as he would do whatever they might decide should be right. About this time conscientious objections were presented. *But after further conversation, the objections urged on account of the article on secret workings, and the objection "ON A POINT OF CONSCIENCE," WERE LAID ASIDE;* and Bro. Weethee and Needham proposed to accept Bro. Himes' proposition, to submit the matter "to a mutual council of elders and brethren, and abide the issue," on condition that that council should publish the result of the investigations. They were told that that would be at the discretion of the council, as they deemed duty to require. They insisted that they should be bound to publish the result as extensively as the objectionable article had been published. This proposition was presented to Bro. Himes, acceded to by him, and returned to them with the assurance that he would accept the terms which they had proposed. But at this moment, when we supposed that all was decided upon, they refused, or at least neglected, to confirm the terms of settlement. During this delay (which lasted until Bro. Merchant had retired from the mediation), the report came to Bro. Weethee as to the action of the Conference below. The terms before presented to Bro. Himes from these brethren,—to which he acceded,—were now positively declined by them.

In hope, C. B. TURNER.

The foregoing movement, made in the dark, was the cause of the article on "Secret Workings," in the "Herald" of May 18th. After this development, who will say there was no cause for the appearance of that article? To the above evidence may be added the testimony of the pamphlet itself, which records efforts steadily and energetically continued in, to perfect the plot which was, so providentially for the cause, detected before the work was consummated.

We will recapitulate. We find him prejudicing the mind of Elder Cummings, telling him that those who differed in opinion from the conductors of the "Herald" were not well treated in it, yet misused in its columns in such an unsuspecting manner that they should not discover it by any thing they should read there! Then prejudicing the Burnhams, saying to Edwin, Money due you has been taken from the Church treasury, on the plea of having paid it to you, by Elder Himes, and put into his own pocket; and I have heard Bro. H. speak ill of you; writing to Bro. Mansfield, I have heard Bro. H. speak disrespectfully of you. Please write any facts you know against him. Awful disclosures are coming out about him. Disaffecting the mind of Elder Needham, whispering in the ears of Elder Hawkes, inviting Elder Plummer to take a private walk on the Common for private conversation. Making awful developments at New York, &c. &c., and all for the advancement of the cause—all without a thought of hurting a hair on the head of "Bro. Himes."

Is it any wonder that when Bro. Himes respectfully asks his Church to inquire into these reports, informing them that somebody is thus engaged, that he should declare it an attack on himself? Is it any wonder that when another brings these as charges against Elder H., that Elder W. should do all in his power to defeat a hearing, unless he can first be pronounced innocent of them? Is it a matter of surprise that he should refuse to meet impartial brethren in consultation respecting it? and refuse an investigation any where, except before those whom he had first made parties in the case by getting them to agree to defend him by passing the following:

"Whereas it is the duty of every Church to DEFEND the character of their pastor when assailed, that his instructions may be attended by the Divine blessing and heard without unwarranted prejudice; and whereas J. P. weethee, who has been our pastor for the last year, came a stranger to labor with us, yet with a character UNBLEMISHED; and whereas he is now suffering (as he considers) under severe charges or accusations made against him by a member with us, and by the same circulated privately and in a very public manner through the columns of the "Advent Herald," May 18th, thereby inflicting upon the same, in his estimation, a very serious injury; and whereas the aforesaid Pastor has made known the same to the Church requesting them to act in this matter as the defendants of his character;

"Therefore, Resolved, that in the opinion of this Church, the article in the Advent Herald of May 18th, headed "More Secret Workings," which appears over the signature of J. V. Himes, does contain CHARGES of a serious nature against some person or persons, and that there is sufficient evidence, that the authors of said article did consider J. P. Weethee, the Pastor of the Church aforesaid, as one of the persons therein intended."—pp. 37, 38.

Does it astonish any one that after they had thus prejudged the case, that he should take the judicial chair and sit in judgment on his brethren?

Complaining that he has become known in connection with this business, by the betrayal of those bound to secrecy he says:

"I would ask, if confidential conversation at a man's HOME can be betrayed, when is a person safe? Is there to be fidelity on one side and none on the other? Such has been the course that this matter has taken from the first, that persons have thought they were doing God service when they were betraying to one, man the most sacred trust reposed in them by others. Let such a course be pursued and there is an end of all confidence, and we shall look on each other in the light of informers."—p. 25.

Is an "informer" a disreputable person? His associate claimed to be "only an informer." How will he reconcile this charge of betrayal of confidence, with his former plea, that he had had no such confidential communications? If various persons pouring into the ears of one man, would cause them to "look on each other in the light of informers," in what light do he and his associates regard each other? In what work, different from that, have they been engaged?

After giving his version of the progress of things in New York, he says: "Let us now trace the Elder from the day he lands in Boston, to the Conference in that city. What was his course in the Chardon-street Church, in the absence of its pastor to Philadelphia? He visits private families with J. Pearson, who tells of deeds of horrid darkness, secret plots, and intended assassination, (spiritual) and hints so distinctly the name of the chief conspirator, that even the Sabbath school children go to their homes and say, they don't want to hear Bro. Weethee lecture any more, for he is trying to KILL Bro. Himes."—p. 25.

On returning from New York, Elder Pearson said he wished to see the colored sister who was said to have been wronged by Bro. Himes of \$1,500. They first went to see a sister who was dying and offered to her Christian consolation in the closing struggle.—They then called on the colored sister, and Elder Pearson made inquiries of her, Bro. Himes previously saying nothing. They then went to find Wood and Marshall; but going by Mrs. Nourse's house, where Bro. H. had business, having no connection with Elder W.'s case, they called there and he transacted that, and then the only call they made was on Wood and Marshall, associates with Mr. Weethee in this business. Besides these they made no calls. Why is it that the simple truth should be thus distorted? and a plain statement of facts be so distasteful? The "children" who did not want to hear Elder W. lecture, was a single child, who had not seen them, and whose father saw Mr. Weethee's course at New York!

He then says: "He had a committee appointed from the Church, consisting of J. Emerson and J. G. Hamblin, not to search out, but to receive charges."—On page 27 Elder N. says, it "was the action of the Church, at his request, appointing a committee to search into the origin and nature of the rumors against him." When the parties agree among themselves, it will be time to notice the accuracy of the statement agreed on.

He then, comes to the first Conference in Boston, and says: "How much of the Advent funds were expended in collecting this full assembly in Boston I say not."—page 26. He can easily estimate by adding the worth of time, and the expense, of coming to and returning from it, for each person present. Does he grudge them the right to make such a use of their time and money as they feel disposed? He says: "It will be necessary in this place to state one fact, that heretofore our conferences have not been delegated bodies, but volunteer associations, made up of all Advent believers, male or female, who had leisure and means to come. In this way there might be 30 or 40 from one church, or many who belonged to Baptist, Methodist or Orthodox churches." This is very true. It has been our boast that bigotry and sectarianism found no place among us. The object of Advent Conferences is thus expressed, in an address sent forth by the first one held, which was convened in Boston Oct. 14, 1840, in the Chardon-street Chapel.

"Our object in assembling at this time, our object in addressing you, and our object in other efforts, separate and combined, on the subject of 'the kingdom of heaven at hand,' is to revive and restore this ancient faith, to renew the ancient landmarks, to 'stand in the ways, and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way' in which our fathers walked, and the martyrs 'found rest to their souls.' We have no purpose to distract the churches with any new inventions, or to get to ourselves a name by starting another sect among the followers of the Lamb. We neither condemn, nor rudely assail, others of a faith different from our own, nor dictate in matters of conscience for our brethren, nor seek to demolish their organizations, nor build new ones of our own; but simply to express our convictions like Christians, with the reasons for entertaining them which have persuaded us to understand the word and promises, the prophecies and the gospel, of our Lord, as the first Christians, the primitive ages of the church, and the profoundly learned and intelligent reformers, have unanimously done, in the faith and hope that the Lord will 'come quickly' 'in his glory,' to fulfil all his promises in the resurrection of the dead.

"We are agreed and harmonize with the published creed of the Episcopal, Dutch Reformed, Presbyterian, and Methodist churches, together with the Cambridge Platform of the Congregational church, and the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic churches, in maintaining that Christ's second and only coming now will be 'to judge the world at the last day.'

"We are not of those who sow discord among

brethren, who withdraw from the fellowship of the churches, who rail at the office of the ministry, and triumph in the exposure of the errors of a secular and apostate church, and who count themselves holier than others, or wiser than their fellows. The gracious Lord has opened to us wondrous things in his word whereof we are glad, and in view of which we rejoice with fear and trembling. We reverently bless his name, and we offer these things, with the right hand of our Christian fellowship and union, to all disciples of our common Lord, of every sect and denomination, praying them, by the love of crucified Jesus, to regard 'the promise of his coming,' and to cultivate 'the love of his appearing,' and to sanctify themselves in view of his approaching with power and great glory; although they conscientiously differ from us in minor points of faith, or reject some of the peculiarities which exist in individuals of this Conference.

"We do not seek to excite the prejudices of our fellow-men, or to join with those who mock at sin, or who scoff at the word or promise of the great Jehovah, or who lightly esteem offices and ordinances of the church, or who empty of their power the threatenings of the holy law, or who count the blood of the atonement a useless thing, or who refuse to worship and honor the Son of God, even as they honor the Father; nor do we refuse any of these, or others of divers faith, whether Roman or Protestant, who receive and heartily embrace the doctrine of the Lord's coming in his kingdom: for reason and experience unite to teach, in the words of the apostle, that 'every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it;' and the vivid apprehension of its approach tries and consumes the wood, and hay, and stubble, among our opinions, and we all become, by gentle necessity, the lambs of one flock, and are led into one fold, under the hand of the chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls."

Report of the Gen. Con., Boston, Oct. 1840—pp. 20-23.

We hope it will be a long time before we shall set up a sectarian standard, and disfellowship any who give evidence that they love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; or give the lie to past professions, by closing the doors in the face of any humble followers of the Saviour, who sympathize with us in the great objects of our mission.

W. proceeds, same page: "It was soon seen that the old managers had the control of all matters, and that it was useless for any others to propose business for action." Did he suppose that old and tried friends were to be set aside for the benefit of new managers who were still "strangers" to the brethren?

He says, same page: "The nature, spirit, and works of that Conference, I shall not attempt to describe. The reckless 'AMENS,' the deeply rooted prejudice and partiality, the unchristian spirit, and intemperate speeches made and exhibited by many members, are a deep stain on our former character. Two persons were forced to hear, for nearly four days, the most vulgar and reproachful epithets applied to them, that could well be invented, at least by Christian professors." The numerous and respectable brethren who were present will see how they are regarded by Elder W. A fairer representation of Adventists in New England could not probably be collected. The brethren at large will judge from this manifestation of regard for the opinion and judgment of others, the origin of his scruples to leave the difficulties to a committee of mutual friends.

He comes on page 28 to the charges presented by Elder Needham, on the authority of Madam "Rumor" and "Common Fame." By this time our readers have no difficulty in discerning what two individual personate those nonentities. As those charges were duly considered a few weeks since, and as they will come up in another place and form, that portion of the pamphlet will be here passed over, except as it may be noticed by the committee of the Church, and portions of it be attended to under other heads.

The falsity of the charges on which a mock trial was had, will be duly attended to in their order.

#### Testimony of Elder Jones.

New York, Sept. 4th, 1850.

I have read the pamphlet, purporting to be your trial before a party claiming to be the Chardon-st. Church, and it forcibly reminds me of a threat which I heard uttered in your office, the week after the spring conference in Boston, by MICAH WOOD. It made a deep impression on my mind at the time, and I have frequently mentioned it since. I could not, however, at the time, persuade myself that he really intended to carry out that threat, but supposed he intended to frighten you to a settlement on his terms. I will state the threat, and leave your readers to judge how far, if at all, it has been fulfilled.

Mr. WOOD said to you: "We have arranged to settle this matter. We (meaning the Church, as I understood him,) will clear you—give you a clean breast, as you call it—and you must clear WEETHEE." To this you replied: "What have I to do with Eld. WEETHEE in the matter of these charges? they are presented by Eld. NEEDHAM; and I ask you to investigate them, and say to my brethren abroad whether they are true or false."

Mr. M. WOOD at once became greatly impassioned, and said: "Well, if you want to press this matter, go on. You will get enough of it before you get through with it. There are more than fifty disaffect-



ed persons in this city who would swear to anything that was ever said about you; and NEEDHAM will carry this matter as far as you want to carry it."

You will perhaps recollect my saying to you afterwards, that if Mr. W. really meant what he said, you must make up your mind for the worst; for there would be nothing left undone to ruin you.

It seems that Mr. M. Wood, Mr. WEETHEE's chief counsellor (if not original informant, in some of these things,) in this case, knew of nothing against you up to that time which the veil of charity could not cover up—he could have then given you a "clean breast"—provided you would have cleared Weethee!

I. E. JONES.

Letter from Deacon P. Hobart, of Boston.

Boston (Mass.), Sept. 9th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. HIMES:—I have for some time felt it to be duty to say a few words to you respecting your trials, which have been a great grief to me. It is with deep feelings that I say what I do, sensible that the eye of God is upon me.

It has been one of the most trying scenes of my life, now, at the advanced age of 67, to be called into action betwixt two ministers whom I so tenderly loved. My first impression was, that Mr. Weethee had said some things which he ought not to have said, and probably would not have said, if he had rightly understood your business. I found there was more blame laid to him than I was willing to think he was guilty of. But then I thought he must have been some to blame. I had a long interview with him. I thought him to be sincere. He succeeded in convincing me that he had no intentions of injuring you in any way, and I expressed that opinion to others. But on further examination, it seemed otherwise,—that is, that I was mistaken. If I had any doubts or fears about it, the pamphlet published, professing to be the trial of Elder J. V. Himes, has removed them all, and established the fact, in my opinion, that there was a secret plan laid to destroy your usefulness, which was utterly denied when it first came to my knowledge. It is one of the most astonishing things to me that I have met with during my whole life, that any of those, not only professing godliness, but looking for the coming of our blessed Lord and Saviour to call us to an account for all the deeds done in the body, should be striving to injure their brethren. Should he come and find such doings, would he say to such, "Well done, good and faithful servant?"

Well, dear brother, we know not the trials we have yet to pass through. We are surrounded with evils, and dangers, and temptations. O that God's grace may be sufficient for us, that we may never render evil for evil, but ever follow that which is good, not only amongst ourselves, but unto all men, that we may be blameless and harmless. Let others do as they will, as for us we will serve the Lord. Yours, in Christian love and fellowship, PETER HOBART.

Bro. Hobart was a member of the Park-street (Congregational) Church in this city. He received a dismission from that Church the past year, accompanied by an attestation of his regular standing and the purity of his character; and on that recommendation was received by the Chardon-street Church.

Correspondence of Elders Judson, Needham, and Weethee, with Elder L. D. Mansfield.

The following correspondence would have appeared in its proper place, had not Bro. Mansfield hesitated to furnish it, on account of threats to prosecute, a request to burn, &c., till too late:—

LETTER FROM ELD. L. D. MANSFIELD, OF SYRACUSE.

DEAR BRO. HIMES:—It is a painful alternative in which I am now called to act. I must see a brother, whom I have long known and loved as a man of surpassing energy and devotedness to the cause of God, followed with the evident purpose of blasting all his prospects of usefulness, and utterly destroying a character which has borne, unscathed, the malignity of open foes and false friends, for the last twelve years—or I must expose, to the public gaze, the correspondence of one whom I have also known and loved, as a friend and brother, for about the same length of time, and also the correspondence of two other brethren, in order to show what motives and feelings have been in exercise in pursuing the course which those brethren, who have originated the "Pamphlet," have taken, and the ultimate object aimed at by those brethren. I have long hesitated to make public, letters which were confidentially written, and which I knew must, in the very nature of them, confirm all your suspicions relative to the purpose actuating the movers in this war upon your character. But I must act according to my convictions of duty, though it may cost "a right hand" or "a right eye;" and I therefore proceed to state to you all I know of this painful affair, and to submit to your numerous friends and to the world—a correspondence, which I should have felt bound to keep to myself, but for the evidence which it contains, when compared with subsequent developments, that the spirit which prompted, and the motives which actuated the movers in this affair, were far from being so disinterested as has been claimed. I am conscious of no personal unkindness toward either of those brethren, and would have been glad to have seen them pursue a different course, from that pursued in the trial of Bro. Himes, and in the publication of the "Pamphlet;" which, by the way, will be better appreciated, after reading the accompanying letters, especially those which are over Bro. Needham's signature.—Not that Bro. N. was at the bottom of this affair, but that he has revealed substantially who was, and what the design was on the part of the originators of this movement.

The first letter which I received throwing

any light upon this subject was from L. P. Judson.

LETTER FROM L. P. JUDSON.

Salem, Mass., April 3, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—\* \* \* The particular object of writing to you is to make several suggestions concerning the general interests of our cause.

The "Class for Mutual Improvement" met on Monday of this week, and among other things appointed a committee, consisting of Brn. Weethee and Needham and myself, to draft some general outline of a plan to secure more efficient labors in the cause, and to arrange several things which seem now to hang at rather loose ends.

It is no part of our object to legislate on doctrines to be preached, but to devise the best means of disseminating the doctrines we cherish.

It is suggested whether we cannot have some plan or general understanding of the division of labor, so that brethren shall not, as it is now frequently, send appointments so as to have two or three with the same church at nearly or quite the same time, and then perhaps none for one or more months.

Also, that there should be some arrangement concerning our missionary funds and labor. Who shall be the almoners of the bounties of the Church. Who shall direct as to the disbursement, &c.

Does the interest of the cause demand the publication of another paper? If so, is Buffalo, Syracuse, or New York, the best location?—What is the relation that our present papers sustain to the cause?

Have we not several young men who ought to be preparing by a study of the Word to become preachers? What is the best way to lead them into the work? &c. &c.

The above are among the general points we want to consider at New York Conference, and if we cannot conclude on arrangements there, to complete them at Boston.

I write at the suggestion of brethren, and please allow me to depend on you to write to Mr. Bates and other brethren in your vicinity, and secure as good an attendance at N. Y. as may be. If these things are considered, you will see that much importance will be attached to our deliberations at that Conference. Will you not also write some one member of the committee—perhaps Bro. Needham, at Worcester—and give us any suggestions you have to make on any or all of the above points, or any others. "In a multitude of counsellors there is safety." Give us the best advice you can, that we may be able to give a thoroughly digested plan. \* \* \* Yours, &c.

L. P. JUDSON.

This letter was quite misapprehended at first, as I had not the remotest idea that Judson, and the other members of the Committee named, could be engaged in any movement subversive of the "Advent Herald;" and when Judson inquired, "What relation do our present papers sustain to the cause?" I supposed that he was referring more especially to the Western paper—as he also inquired, "Whether we needed another paper? and if so, whether Buffalo, Syracuse, or New York, was the best location?" all of which places are in New York State, where the "Harbinger" is located. And I was aware, that Judson had endeavored before, to buy out the "Harbinger," and had for years manifested a wonderful itching to be connected with the paper publishing business; a position to which I apprehend he would only need to have called himself, in order to get a most decided verdict from the brethren, to the purport, that they did not consider him a suitable person for that position.

It might be a matter of surprise that Judson himself did not attend the New York Conference, after saying that "MUCH IMPORTANCE would be attached to our deliberations at New York," and requesting the attendance of Bro. Bates and myself, were we not in possession of many statements of his making in different places, which he was evidently indisposed to meet in the presence of yourself and the Advent brethren. Therefore, concluding that "discretion was the better part of valor," he goes West before the N. Y. Conference, and does not return, though he told me at Syracuse, as he was going home, that he intended to return to the N. Y. Conference, and that the brethren East had contributed so that he had the means to go.

I regard Judson as one of the movers in this effort to get possession of, or to supplant the "Herald," though from your other correspondence (see Elder Osler's statement, &c.) his "workings" were not as "secret" as some others.

This was my only letter from L. P. Judson, but acting upon his suggestion, I wrote Bro. Needham at Worcester, as a member of that Committee, and subsequently received the following letter, which filled me with grief and astonishment, and showed me that I had not understood the enigmas of Judson's letter. I here give Bro. N.'s letter, with remarks:

FIRST LETTER FROM G. NEEDHAM.

Worcester (Mass.), April 9th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—I write to inquire of you a little about the expenses of the Syracuse Tent meeting last summer. Soon after that meeting Bro. Himes wrote to me that, that meeting cost HIM fifty

dollars. It has ever been a wonder to me when I have thought of it since, how it could cost fifty dollars, over and above all that brethren there did to sustain it. In the "Herald" of March 23d is a statement, entitled, "Tract and Mission Fund," which needs an explanation. That statement has called my attention anew to the fifty dollar item at Syracuse. Will you do me the favor to communicate immediately, as Brn. Weethee, Judson, and myself, have been appointed a committee to prepare some plan for action at New York, and probably Boston, at the Conference. We wish to get such information in regard to the use of our money as will enable us hereafter to know how it is used. You will see by that statement that Bro. Himes has expended over seven hundred dollars, as he claims for Missionary and Tract purposes, and besides four hundred dollars more for other purposes. [Note 1.]

Over eleven hundred dollars expended; by whom? By any agent of Conference? No. Conference at Boston appointed over thirty persons to assist in getting up and sustaining Advent meetings in the United States, not one of whom, so far as I know, has been consulted in the distribution of these funds.—Bro. Bliss was appointed Treasurer (for minutes, see "Herald," June 16, '49); and how he has disposed of the funds (near \$500) is best known to himself. We must suppose that he and Bro. Himes have disposed of them together, but by what authority Bro. H. has meddled with them I know not, he not having any trust of any kind committed to him last spring. [Note 2.]

Disclosures have recently been made which have disaffected some of Bro. Himes' warmest friends in this region. I mention Brn. Weethee, Edwin, Elam, and Wesley Burnham, Judson, J. Cummings, besides almost the entire Chardon-street Church.

A crisis has come, such as I never expected. [Note 3.] We wish you could come to both Conferences, but you must not fail to be at New York. We would like also if Bro. Bates is prepared to stand up against any storm that may arise, if he would come. But neither he nor any other person should know anything about the matter unless they keep it the most profound secret, till they see the friends in this region, and have an explanation. This whole movement has originated with Bro. Himes' old and tried friends, who have stood by him in every hour—but they will stand there no longer, unless he clears up the dark clouds that now lower around. It is for his good, that of the cause, and all concerned, that there should be an investigation. [Note 4.]

We wish to manage the matter so that Bro. H. will be as little injured as possible—for we are his friends. He was with me yesterday,\* but has no suspicion of the movement, and the success of it depends on his not knowing it till all is ready. I entrust this to you, Bro. Mansfield, as a man of God, who I know to be true. Betray it not, my brother; nay, I know you will not. O if you knew an hundredth part of what I do, you would be astonished, you would need no caution. [5.] Perhaps I ought to give you a general item or two. It is believed by some of the brethren in the Chardon-street Church, who have made estimates, that Bro. Himes is worth from \$12,000 to \$14,000! He proposed to buy Chardon-st. Chapel to "save the cause" in Boston, yet he charges \$600 rent! While here the other evening, he said he had left his "subscription for the cause," for two hundred dollars, for this year. I have learned since how he pays \$200—charges \$600 rent, minus two, leaving four! Four hundred dollars wrenched out of that poor congregation. This is 8 per cent. on \$5000. Besides, he has the use of the upper part.

After Bro. Weethee went to Boston, he expended what funds he had, but nothing was done for him for six weeks; then, after a week's delay, being informed of his necessities, seventy dollars was raised for Bro. W., and Bro. Himes took the money, saying, "Now I will make Bro. Weethee's heart glad to-morrow morning;" but after seven days' more delay, paid fifty of it over, and the brethren never knew till a few days since, but that he paid all over—in conversation with Bro. W. it came out. These are specimens—but not the worst. O brother, what are we coming to! Since I commenced writing I got down to pray, and have wept heartily over this matter. Yours,

G. NEEDHAM.

P.S. Write me immediately, and do not fail to come to New York. We may want a new editor of —. Would you be willing if it comes to that? Think, but not aloud, we are living in perilous times—may our God sustain us. I confess I feel strange, but God will defend the right. [Note 6.]

REMARKS.

I freely confess that this letter shook my confidence a little in yourself (Bro. Himes), but not so much as to lead me to take sides with those whom he represented as disaffected. Several points must be noticed. In reply to the inquiries relating to the Tent Meeting I informed Bro. N. that I had no accurate account of the receipts and expenditures, as the money did not all pass through my hands, but from the best calculation I could make, there might have been that amount (\$50,) expended by Bro. Himes there.

Note 1.—Bro. N. refers to the amount which Bro. Himes represented himself to have expended in the cause, and exclaims, "over eleven hundred dollars expended—by whom?" By any agent of Conference? No! . . . . Bro. Bliss was appointed treasurer, and how he has disposed of the funds (over \$500) is best known to himself. We must suppose that he and Bro. Himes have disposed of them together; but by what authority Bro. H. has meddled with them, I know not, he not having any trust of any kind committed to him last spring.

I must confess I was surprised at this paragraph at the time, for I supposed this fund was

\* Elder N. said in the Conference, that when Elder Himes left his house at this time, he had the fullest fellowship for him. That afternoon a man went to him "in a flood of tears."—Edo.

raised to aid in the work of scattering light on the Advent, and was designed especially to further the efforts, which Bro. Himes had been most energetically putting forth for years, in the "Missionary and Tract" cause. The receipts and disbursements, for the above cause had been acknowledged in the "Herald," and if "over eleven hundred dollars" had been expended in this cause, and Brn. Bliss and Himes had acted in concert about it, what wonderful iniquity was there in it? Had Brn. Himes and Bliss no right to confer together in the matter? Strange that two men so intimately associated should not be allowed to advise together in the use of monies paid in for the express purpose of doing, on a little more enlarged scale, what the "Herald" office had always been doing to spread the doctrine of the coming of Christ. But I ask, if the language used by Bro. N. does not imply that Brn. Himes and Bliss had dishonestly perverted these funds? "Bro. Bliss was appointed treasurer, and how he has disposed of the funds is best known to himself. We must suppose that he and Bro. Himes have disposed of them together."!!!

This looks to me cruel and uncharitable in the extreme. These two brethren who, with other noble hearted men, have borne the heat and burden of the Advent conflict, and have labored untiringly for this holy cause for years, are here impliedly guilty of the surpassing wickedness of misappropriating the funds contributed by their brethren and sisters, to warn the world and prepare them for the coming of Christ!!

This statement, together with what is said, toward the close of the letter, relative to the Chapel and Bro. Weethee's matters, led me to understand that Bro. Himes was regarded as a dishonest man; and also led me to inquire in my next letter "if Bro. Bliss was implicated in the dishonesty?" The answer will appear in the next letter from Bro. N.

Bro. N. says further: "Conference appointed over thirty persons to assist in getting up meetings in various parts of the United States, not one of whom, so far as I know, has been consulted in the distribution of these funds." I ask, were they appointed as the disbursing committee? No. They were "appointed to get up meetings." Was there any vote of Conference that these funds should pay the expenses of those meetings? No. Did any of these brethren ask for funds or tracts without getting aid? I think not.

But Bro. Needham exclaims, "Over eleven hundred dollars expended by whom? By any agent of Conference? No!" Now, Bro. Bliss was Treasurer, and if the Conference had no agent for the purpose of carrying on the Tract and Mission enterprise,—it is plain that Bro. Bliss himself should appropriate the funds,—or wait a year for Conference to appoint some one to do it. But Bro. Bliss knew that we had not been so exceedingly particular in our arrangements, as to require any great formality, and that Bro. Himes was considered, virtually, the disbursing agent of the Advent body,—by the very position which he occupied, as publisher of tracts and as an evangelist laboring in all parts of the land, and holding meetings which cost necessarily very considerable sums of money.

But to the point. Was Bro. Himes virtually the "agent of the Conference"? Bro. Needham says in this letter, "No! This money was not expended by any agent of Conference." Now I wish to quote from his plea. ("Pamphlet," page 98,) "We go back (says Bro. N.) even to the commencement, and we find him (Himes) first only editor, but subsequently publisher, yet all along declaring that he is not the 'proprietor,' that he is only an 'agent' of the Advent body, and though there has been no formal vote declaring him such, yet by common consent, and by the oft repeated votes of different conferences, approving his course, he is VIRTUALLY RECOGNIZED AS SUCH."

Here we have a flat contradiction. In his letter to me, he declares Bro. Himes "is no agent of Conference"; and on the floor of the Conference in Boston, in opposing a resolution "approving Bro. H.'s course," he says that "Bro. Himes is no agent of Conference," and therefore they ought not to express their confidence in him in that associated capacity.

But now we read in the "Pamphlet," from Bro. N.'s own pen, that, "by common consent, and by the oft repeated votes of different conferences, he was virtually recognized as agent for the cause."

When had "this virtual recognition" of this relationship between Bro. H. and his brethren ever been nullified, that he should be accused of "meddling" with the funds of the cause, when in addition to the monies contributed by brethren, he expended also several hundred dollars, which by his industry and untiring zeal he had secured to himself to be appropriated as he chose to do?

No Conference had ever directly, or indirectly, disapproved of his appropriations of means, and he was still "virtually the agent of Conference," if he had ever been.



While on this point let me say, that I do not see any discrepancy between Bro. Himes' professions of "agency" and "proprietorship." In one sense he is *agent*, in another, *proprietor*.

An agent is a *steward*—we are all stewards of our property and talents—and are also proprietors. To illustrate: say that President Weethee is converted to the Advent faith. He communicates with his brethren, both orally and by letter, on the subject of his new faith. He says: "I have sacrificed two professions, which cost me \$1,500, for the Advent faith. I have consecrated myself, and all I have, to the work. I have laid all upon the altar. I feel that I am not my own," &c.

Now would any one suppose that Br. W. belied his professions, if he should build a brick house in Cincinnati, and upon being asked, who was the "proprietor" of that house, should say he was? Or if he had purchased a library to aid him in his work, would any one suppose that he had falsified his professions, if he should say to an inquirer, "These books are my property"? If Bro. Needham makes similar professions of consecration to the cause of God, (and we all make them,) does he consider that the Advent cause (Conference) has claims upon him, and can use his money earned as "Chaplain of the Legislature"—or in any other way,—as they please? No! surely not!

But should his brethren—at large, or individually—give him funds for a special purpose, and he misappropriate them, they would have cause to complain. So if our brethren have given Bro. Himes more money to use for the "Tract and Mission cause" than he has used in that way, they might complain; but now he has used some hundreds of dollars of his own, and this is a grievous offence.

How could you, Bro. Himes, commit such a sin, as to give any of your own hard earnings, to spread the truth without an order from—whom? Perhaps I should say, President Weethee and G. Needham!! I do not know whom else they would have consulted, for they are the complainants.

This whole array of supposed discrepancies, amounts to nothing, to those who are willing to see the truth.

Note 2.—But in another place, a most desperate blow is aimed at Bro. Himes' reputation. "Disclosures have recently been made which have disaffected some of Bro. Himes' warmest friends in this region. I mention Brn. Weethee, Edwin, Wesley, and Elam Burnham, Judson, and Cummings, and almost the whole Chardon-street Church. A crisis has come such as I never expected."

The fact that so many brethren in the ministry were disaffected, and "almost all Chardon-street Church," staggered my confidence much, but I was not then aware of the influences which had been brought to bear on these persons, to make them "disaffected;" but it will appear in full in the defence of this case.

Note 3.—Bro. Needham urges me by all means to come to the New York Conference, and wishes "Bro. Bates to be prepared to stand up against any storm that may arise;" and then says: "The whole affair has originated with Bro. Himes' tried friends, who have stood by him in every hour, but will stand there no longer unless he clears up the dark clouds which now lower around." He further adds: "It is for his good, and the good of the cause, that there should be an investigation."

What influences could be drawn from such remarks, but that Bro. Himes' case was to be investigated at New York; and if on trial he could not "clear up the dark clouds," his brethren—"tried friends"—"would stand by him no longer." Now here we see that the purpose of Bro. N. and his associates was to try Bro. Himes in New York, at the Conference. How does this compare with their utter repudiation of any tribunal, except the local Church, of which Bro. Himes was a member? How does it compare with Needham's objection to the Conference passing a vote expressive of confidence in Bro. Himes, when he said that to do so, would be "forestalling the action of the Church of which Himes was a member."

Suppose the New York Conference had passed a vote that they could not in view of the report of "Common fame," (alias, President Weethee,) any longer approve of Bro. Himes' course. Do you think these brethren would have been so much afraid of "forestalling the action of the Chardon-street Church?" Nay, verily. But how happened they to discover that it was desperate wickedness, and "taking the place of the head of the Church"—for any other body besides the local Church of which Bro. Himes was a member to *intermeddle* with this matter? When they found that their plan had leaked out, and that the New York Conference was not made up of the material which would enable them to carry out their plan, they changed their plan, as will be seen in the process of this investigation, but their design will further appear, and you must decide whether there were any "secret workings."

Note 4.—"We wish (says Bro. N.) to manage the matter so that Bro. Himes will be in-

jured as little as possible, for we are his friends. He was with me yesterday, but has no suspicion of the movement, and the success of it depends on his NOT KNOWING TILL ALL IS READY. BETRAY IT NOT, my brother, nay, I know you will not. O if you knew an HUNDREDTH PART of what I do, you would be astonished, you would need no caution."—And before he had said: "Neither Bro. Bates, nor any other person, should know anything about it, unless they keep it the most PROFOUND SECRET, till they see the friends in this region and hear an explanation." They "wished to manage the matter so that Bro. Himes would be injured as little as possible, FOR WE ARE HIS FRIENDS." How strange such language sounds, after reading subsequent letters and the PAMPHLET. I will only say, that if they have pursued such a course as to "injure Bro. Himes as little as possible," then I do not know what course they could have pursued to injure him as MUCH AS POSSIBLE.

Bro. N. adds: "He [Bro. H.] was with me yesterday, but has no SUSPICION OF THE MOVEMENT." What does this indicate? A readiness to "tell Bro. Himes his fault between him and thee alone"?—No! Why did he not say to Bro. Himes, that there were rumors against him, and ask for an explanation? He might have obtained answers which would have saved all this unhappy, and in all probability, final alienation of brethren!

"The success of the movement depends upon HIS NOT KNOWING TILL ALL IS READY." The least that can be said of this expression is, that they were to come upon him in an *unprepared moment*, and that their *entire movement* would be a failure, unless they could keep Bro. H. in ignorance of the movement. Is this "doing as they would be done unto"? If they were disposed to do everything for God, and in open daylight, and to give Bro. H. an opportunity to defend himself against the assault that was evidently contemplated upon his character, why say that "the success of the movement depends upon his not knowing till all is ready"? In my reply to Bro. N., I expressed the hope that no public investigation would be had, but that Bro. H. would be seen by a committee of his brethren, who were aware of the reports circulated against him.

Bro. N. says further: "BETRAY IT NOT, my brother; nay, I know you will not. . . . Neither Bro. Bates, nor any body else, should know anything about it, unless they KEEP IT THE MOST PROFOUND SECRET, until they see the friends in this region; and hear an explanation from them."

This imposition of SECRECY I faithfully regarded, and only confided the matter to one or two besides Bro. Bates, (and these persons were very especial friends of Bro. Himes), and not a word reached Bro. Himes from me previous to the New York Conference. I fully expected to attend this Conference, and purposed, that first of all, a committee of those brethren, who were aware of these reports, should wait on Bro. Himes privately, and open this matter to him, and this I knew would be "doing as I would be done by." But I was providentially hindered from attending that Conference, and of course could have nothing to do with arrangements, except by advice.

Immediately after the New York Conference, I received a letter from Bro. Himes, inquiring if I "had written to L. P. Judson, J. P. Weethee, or G. Needham, implicating him in bad conduct at the West?" I wrote him I had not, for I knew of no conduct of this kind. Here I first learned that Bro. H. was aware of the movements of these men, and then asked him some pertinent questions relative to his office, &c., in order to satisfy myself, and informed him that I had received letters from the East (no names were called) relating to those matters, and to his integrity in other respects. This I felt was right and proper, as I had not the opportunity of seeing Bro. H. in person. It seems that the fact of my having held correspondence with Needham and Weethee on this subject was brought to the ears of Bro. Himes by way of Judson, who opened the matter to a brother, who informed Bro. H. I suppose I shall be severely censured by those who sympathize in this movement, for now exposing this correspondence; and I will now only say, that this letter imposes secrecy upon myself, Bro. Bates, and any who might have had the matter confided to them, only until "we heard an explanation from brethren at the East," and I should suppose that period had now come—we have seen the "Pamphlet." I have a clear conscience now—not, however, altogether on the ground of the time for secrecy having expired, but because I am persuaded that at this stage of the affair it is due to Bro. H., to the brethren, and to the cause of God, that there should be an expose of the origin of this matter, that they may see why the land has been ransacked for old or new scandals, in order to put down Bro. Himes at all events. Never, until I became satisfied that Elders Weethee and Needham had determined to crush Bro. Himes, was I willing to give publicity to their letters.

By subsequent letters, it will be seen more clearly, that I am not bound to regard as confidential any longer the letters of those who have had so uncharitable a purpose to subvert as the ruin—THE UTTER RUIN—of a man who has done so much for this best of causes. I dare not, as a Christian man, justify so unrighteous a crusade, as I must needs do, if I concealed the evidence of their primary designs, when their subsequent acts confirmed the opinion that SELF was at the bottom of this movement, though they might have been entirely unconscious of the main-spring of their movements.

Note 5.—Bro. N. also says: "If you knew an hundredth part of what I do, you would be astonished, you would need no caution," i. e. to keep the matter SECRET. And then proceeds to name several items in which you had acted, as he alleged, very dishonestly. These charges you have explained quite to my satisfaction, and in other places in your defence the full explanation of them will be found. I only wish to say, that the language of Bro. N. is very comprehensive.—"An hundredth part of what I know," and

then, after giving two or three items, says: "These are specimens, but not the worst."

Now I ask, What must be thought of you in such a case? Bro. Needham thinks I would be "astonished" if I knew "one hundredth part" of what—he had heard!—had been "rumored"?—had come upon the winds of "common fame"? No! of what he "KNEW." Who cannot see that if I had full confidence in Bro. Needham, I could scarcely have a particle in Bro. Himes. No apology can be offered for the declaration, that he "knew" a hundred fold more than would be quite sufficient to strike me dumb. Is this the "charity that hopeth all things"? I throw not; and I have earnestly entreated Bro. N. since to "come out and confess, that he had done wrong in giving so much confidence to these reports;" but he has persisted in his course. This has changed my mind in reference to his disinterestedness in this matter. To me, he writes privately, that he "knows" things worse than *extortion* and *dishonesty*;—and when the article entitled "Secret Workings," calls him and others out, he then says, "rumor" and "common fame" charge Elder Himes with wrong, under seven specifications,—instead of "an hundred, which he 'KNEW.'"

Note 6.—In Bro. N.'s postscript, he says: "Write me immediately, and do not fail to come to New York. We may want a new editor of ———, would you be willing, if it comes to that? Think! but not aloud, we are living in perilous times. May our God sustain us. I confess I feel strange, but God will defend the right."

Here the great purpose is hinted at. A "new editor of the 'Herald,'" (for no one can doubt in this connection that ——— signifies the "Herald.") This makes Bro. N. "feel strange"—leads him almost to hold his breath in expectation, and to enjoin upon me "not to think aloud."

Alas! for poor human nature! I am pained to say, that it seems clear from all that I can draw from this communication, that the purpose was, to come upon you at the New York Conference—either in private or public—and make an onset with charges, of the intention to present which, they had never notified you, and in reference to which they had enjoined SECRECY upon all who knew, that they might not apprise you of the scheme, saying that "the success of the movement depends upon his not knowing till all is ready,"—"keep it the most profound secret," &c., and then in behalf of the Advent people, demand the giving up of the "Herald," &c., into the hands of the Conference, and then a delegated Conference, which was to meet in Boston, be appointed, by which they hoped to be inducted into the seat of the "triumvirate" (as they call yourself, Hale, and Bliss)—they (Weethee, Needham, and Judson) constituting in their turn, another "triumvirate," to manage the various departments of the "Advent Herald."

The excitement evinced, upon the bare mention of a "new editor," which made Bro. N. "feel strange," partakes very much of that which makes one giddy by being suddenly impressed with the idea of promotion and good fortune.

I think this "motive" and "this ultimate design" will appear more fully in the subsequent letters, to the second of which I now call attention. However, before doing this I will say, that not satisfied to lose confidence in Bro. Bliss and yourself, on the testimony of Bro. N., whom I knew to have, among other imperfections, extraordinary excitability of temper, I wrote to Mr. Weethee, inquiring into the nature of Bro. Himes' delinquencies, and what was their purpose in respect to Bro. H. at New York Conference? Mr. Weethee replied to this effect, that "Mr. Himes had nearly cleared up his matter, and he hoped all would be amicably adjusted," &c., but I afterward, at his request, returned his letter to him, and did not take a copy, as he said he wished to present it in testimony, in the investigation held before his Church in Boston; but I have never heard of the letter having been exposed; and since I commenced this review, I have sent to him for the letter, but have received no reply.

I might say of Bro. Needham also, that I have written him, requesting my letters or copies, that the whole matter may be fairly presented, but he refuses yet, to give me copies. In reference to my letters in reply, I will only say, that they will show, that I endeavored to act a conservative part, and explain how the charges against you might not be well founded, that they might be explained, &c., and they will also show that I was considerably influenced by Bro. N.'s astounding revelations and more astounding secrecies.

#### SECOND LETTER FROM G. NEEDHAM.

Worcester (Mass.), April 18th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—Your last was received Monday. I waited till I should go to Boston, before answering. I went Tuesday, and returned last evening. Had an interview with Brn. Weethee and Judson. You will understand that we were appointed a committee to bring forward general measures at the New York Conference, for the interests of the cause. This appointment was made by the "Class for Mutual Improvement," at its last meeting. It was done without my knowledge or consent. I have never attended one of those meetings. Elder Himes first informed me of the arrangement. He, however, was little aware of the "course of events." He and I started Monday morning of last week to go to Providence, to meet Brn. Weethee and Judson, but by the providence of God, we were just fifteen seconds too late to take the morning train, which was the only one that would answer. The result was, H. returned to Boston, and I to my house; and before night Bro. Weethee came to see me. We look upon every movement from the start of this committee as Providential. Had I foreseen where I should be

placed, they would never have had me on this committee. I have fought one battle that cost me midnight oil, and wearisome days, and many cares, but I have a good conscience through all, and I shall not now shrink, cost it what it may to myself. Nay, facts (or what purport such) have come to my knowledge, that must separate me forever from Elder J. V. Himes, unless he can disprove them; and that he can, I have not the most distant idea. You ask if there "are any other charges than those that relate to his honesty?" "Do you think Bliss and H." (by which I suppose you mean Himes) "are equally implicated?" Ist. I answer the last one first. I think it impossible that Bliss should have been so long in the office, and not know the principles on which it has been managed; especially, when a young man of the most tender regard for moral honesty, by the name of Marshall, (of whom I shall speak again) had not been in the office six weeks, before he came to Bro. Weethee, with his heart full of grief for the dishonesty which he had already discovered! Bro. James Ball, of Boston, was once in that office six months, and has never had any confidence in Himes since. His mother told me yesterday, it was more than she and his father (when he was alive) could do to keep James down, when they said anything in H.'s favor.\*

2d. I do not know as H. has been guilty of drunkenness or lewdness, nor do I believe he has. But this is a fact related by one of the brethren of the Church, and the man, too, who, before H. went into the publishing business, endorsed him \$400, to save him from jail; that there is one Nichols, a professed Adventist (I know his wife), who is in the liquor business, for whom Himes has endorsed notes to carry on that damnable trade, and that some of the bankmen have shown such notes to this brother, and asked him, sneeringly, if Elder Himes did not share in the profits?

3. Another fact. There is one Josselyn, whom I well know, who has been in the habit of drunkenness for two years, and the matter has been well known to H.; yet J. has given (at least some part of the time) fifty dollars a year to the rent of Chardon-street Chapel, and all has gone well. Last fall I called, with H., into J.'s meat-shop, when H. urged him to come to the meeting we were holding. After we went out, I remarked, J. had no interest in religion; if he had, he would find time to come to meeting. H. plastered it all over, saying, he was one of the most interesting men I ever saw, get him waked up a little; but said, he and his family have been sick a good deal lately, which has taken his mind away a little, etc. etc.!!

4. Marshall, the young man mentioned above, is an Irishman. He is the son of a Presbyterian in Ireland, with whom Himes stayed while he was in that part of Ireland. M. came to New York last fall, when H. was holding the Tent-meeting at Brooklyn. Not finding business there, Himes invited him on to Boston. I saw him at Providence—next in B.—When I saw him in B. he was in no business, and boarding in a family of strangers,—mentioned that he got into that family providentially,—i. e., he went into the street, and inquired of a gentleman for a boarding place, and was directed there. I now learn the facts are these: when Himes returned to Boston, he introduced Bro. Marshall to the church, as a member of a family in Ireland, to whom he owed a heavy debt of gratitude. And said he, "I mean so to treat Bro. M., that he shall feel that I can be grateful." After a few days' stay at H.'s house, in which he did not succeed in finding business, H. treated him so coolly that in the grief of his heart, he went into the street—found a police officer, and inquired of him for a boarding place, and was directed as above! His subsequent treatment of that dear young stranger and brother has been barbarous. I cannot tell all—it would fill a sheet.—Suffice it to say, after employing him for some time, and neither half-feeding nor paying him, (for he has gone supperless to bed sometimes), he finally, after about completing a bargain for long-term service, dismissed him unceremoniously, to look out for himself! This is the way he shows gratitude! These facts reveal not only dishonesty, but falsehood, baseness, and cruelty.

5. Now for other facts. When he was up here ten days ago, I had conversation with him about their prospects at Boston, asked if Bro. Weethee would stay? &c.; he thought he would, said he had left his subscription for two hundred dollars, that he could not do so much this year as formerly; that last year it cost him five or six hundred dollars; and some years he had done the whole. (He has frequently told me that he had to sustain the entire cause, pay the minister, and find them a Chapel.) Now, what are the facts? Last year, I understand, they paid him over \$400 rent; (if it is all paid up;) this year he asked \$600, and then offered to give \$200. That is the way to give two hundred! Well, if he tells the truth, the Chapel cost him \$3,500. Four hundred on that would be but a trifle short of twelve per cent. If that is not enough in all conscience, I know not where to stop. So you see in reality he did not offer to give one cent, nor has he given anything the past year.

6. You know Himes has always been in favor of organization. Last fall he brought the subject up again, and in conversation with Bro. W., it was ultimately carried to a consummation. Before the consummation, and after he had brought it forward, the purpose seems to have possessed his mind to get rid of Bro. Weethee. But this is a difficult matter,—he had greatly

\* I have had an interview with Bro. Ball, and he thus explains the matter: L. D. M.

"In regard to the statement of Elder Needham, in a letter to Elder Mansfield, where my name is used, I am misunderstood: I meant to be understood, public affairs, not private. That in pecuniary matters, I have always considered him strictly honest."

Boston, Sept. 9th, 1850.

J. W. BALL



endeared himself to the Church, and there seemed to be but one avenue to reach him.

There was a Bro. Young, a man of considerable influence, who had always opposed organization. All at once J. V. Himes becomes opposed to organization,—goes to Bro. Young, and tells him that he has changed his mind, and thinks, on the whole, that organizations are wrong, and they can get along in Boston well enough without. After thus baiting Young, he hinted his desire to get rid of Weetsee. *But the bait didn't take!!* The fox became a goose too quick! When Bro. Young and other brethren came to compare notes, they found he had used such deception with them, that indignation has possessed them, and they refused to have his name on their subscription, have hired the Chapel of him, and agreed to pay him \$400, or \$500, if he asks it, but it is entirely managed by the Church.

7. You know donations are acknowledged in the "Herald" for the Tract and Mission Fund. Now for a fact. Some time since, an individual much interested in the cause, came into the office and gave \$40 for that purpose, but no acknowledgment has been made of it. It may be on their books; if so, it will appear. I do not believe it, however.

In the statement ("Herald" March 23) \$167 94 are said to be paid in. Now I find acknowledged in "Herald" from May last \$648 41 two hundred of which are from J. V. Himes, \$648 41 minus 200=448 41, which does not agree with their statement; add \$40, and you have \$488 41, which still disagrees. The whole matter is crooked—it needs a jack plane upon it. He complains of the embarrassments of the office, yet there is a stream of money going in all the time. He has acknowledged \$161 97 in the last eleven months, donations to send the "Herald" to the poor. They publish 4700 numbers weekly. We have made an estimate, and find, after a liberal allowance for all expenses, a net profit of 3000 dollars yearly. This, after allowing \$300 for himself, and \$700 for Bliss. Then the profits on books and tracts are full half that sum, if not more. Here, then, we have the snug little sum of \$4500 to be disposed of as he pleases. Were these earnings to go for the good of the cause, they would make the hearts of many of us glad, under our embarrassments. Now we propose, 1st, at New York to define who and what the Advent body is. This will be the ground for all further action.

2. Having secured this, send out a call to all our congregations to send up delegates to the Boston meeting, and then look into the matter, so far as is necessary to secure the great end of our labors. The fact is, and there is no disguising it, our two printing offices are money-making concerns. I am fully convinced that they are like two dogs pulling at a rabbit; and they have nearly pulled it in twain. Now we want to know whether we have any organs as a people, or not. Our purpose is, if the "Herald" is not given up to the body, to start a new paper, which shall belong to, and be under the control of, the great Advent body. This can be done; and we can find a committee of honest men, who will watch over our interests. It is worse than folly for us to put our noses down to the grindstone, till our faces are thin as a shingle, to support two men in pocketing from five to six thousand dollars yearly.

The moment a move is made, a score of our preachers will come to the rescue. The rabbit belongs to the body; and God being my helper, I shall do something to set it before them. I have given you a chapter,—there is more behind, but I did not lay out large enough. Had I the means, I would send you help,—but like you am in debt, and this has already cost me two dollars—but I will suggest this: send appointments along, and you will get some help in that way. Send to Ulica, Brackett's Bridge, Troy, &c.; and if you need help, we will divide with you at New York. Make your arrangements to stay till after Boston meeting, and we will find you places enough to labor in, where I think you will be well sustained. But if you cannot do this, arrange to come to Boston, as this will be the most important. I had to take another slip, so I will say, Himes is gone to New York and Philadelphia, for no good reason in the world—the only valid excuse, was to get a steel engraving for Father Miller; but Bro. Litch would have attended to that, and not made it cost over twenty-five cents, when now it will cost fourteen or fifteen dollars. Who pays such shots? Ans.—The brethren. I observed you were laboring under a mistake in your first letter, and I knew mine would set it right. But, I have stopped the "Harbinger" some weeks ago, and were it not for another object, would do so by the "Herald." Bro. Mansfield, I HAVE NO CONFIDENCE IN EITHER. O for the Lord to come.

G. NEEDHAM.

P. S. If you can, see brother Bates, and break the subject to him, carefully. I wish both could be with us.

#### REMARKS.

Note on 1st par.—"He (Himes) was little aware, &c." He ought to have been aware, and the 18th of

Matthew directs that he should have been informed of his fault privately.

He says he "has fought one battle," &c. The battle, I suppose, was with Bro. Marsh; but he says in a very recent letter, that he was sensible that he had misapprehended Bro. Marsh, and had explained to him, so that Bro. N.'s conscience must have changed on the point.

"And that he can disprove them, I have not the most distant idea." He here prejudices the whole matter, and expresses the opinion that he shall be eternally separated from Bro. H. How could he disprove them, when they were to keep the intention of having an investigation "a profound secret?" and who doubts that "the success of the movement" depended on so keeping it?

He says "Bro. Marshall came to Weetsee full of grief at Bro. H.'s dishonesty." This is doubtless a misrepresentation, for Bro. Marshall makes a different statement. (See Review of "CHARGE 3, SPEC. 1st.") and Bro. Ball says he believes Bro. Himes perfectly honest in his business!! (See his note.)

Note on 2d and 3d pars.—These charges are without foundation, neither the case of Nicholls nor Josselyn is truthfully represented, which will appear elsewhere in this review. (See review of charge 1st, spec. 1st; also charge 6th, spec. 1st.)

Note on 4th par.—These charges of "dishonesty, falsehood, baseness, and cruelty," and the alleged facts upon which they are grounded, will be found appropriately and conclusively answered, to all candid minds, in review of "charge 3d, spec. 1." I will add, however, that having opportunity, I inquired of the domestic in Bro. Himes' family, as to how Marshall was treated. In a frank and honest manner, she declared, that Mr. Marshall was treated as well as if he had been Bro. Himes' own child, and that she never knew him to be neglected at all, and does not think he ever was. She further states, that he (M.) frequently expressed the grateful feelings he had towards Bro. H. and family, and said they treated him as well as their own children. His going "supperless to bed," is small talk, in the ears of those who know the abundant hospitalities of Bro. Himes' house, and no one can fail to see, that it reflects more upon Mrs. Himes than on her husband. None who know her, will believe such imputations. I feel ashamed, that learned "Professors," and dignified ministers, cannot occupy themselves in some more elevated pursuits than giving publicity to such paltry scandal.

Note on 5th par.—Bro. Needham could never have so distorted this matter about the Chapel, if he meant to be ingenuous and fair. He does not tell me, that Bro. Himes pays \$450 for rent of ground on which the Chapel stands; but for full refutation of this false charge, see remarks under head of "Mathematics." I will add, however, that the rent of Chapel last year, as well as the present, was \$600, as fixed by advice of J. G. Hamblin and others. And it will be seen by the certificate of J. Emerson, Treasurer of Chardon-street Society, that instead of "wrenching \$400 from that poor congregation," he gave them over \$400 for that very year!!!

Note on 6th par.—The discrepancies in Bro. H.'s conduct in respect to the "organization," will find but little difficulty of solution, if it be considered, that the kind of organization established, did not correspond with what Bro. H. thought best and proper;—and that he might be in favor of one organization, and not the organization which was arranged. The diverse positions of many others on this subject, is much more open to criticism than the course of Bro. Himes. (On this point see review of 4th charge.) But it should be added, that in the Church meeting, where Bro. Himes had his first hearing, Bro. Young, who, is here referred to by Bro. Needham, cleared Bro. H. of any blame in that matter!!

Note on 7th par.—The discrepancy discovered in the published account of the receipts up to March 23d, and the acknowledgements in the "Herald" from time to time, is a small matter at best. The statement made in the "Herald" March 23d, was furnished Bro. H. by Mr. Flood, the clerk, (as Mr. Flood informs me,) and was a hasty sketch made at the time, on a bit of paper; if therefore it should not perfectly agree with the sums credited, it will be no impeachment of Bro. Himes' integrity. I have been carefully over the account, both in the "Herald" and in the account book, and find no discrepancy which is at all worthy of note. This matter does not need a "jack plane" half as much as it does that "charity which thinketh no evil."

It is said that "the net proceeds of the office must be about \$4 500, to be disposed of as H. pleases," and intimates that the means thus secured does not "go for the good of the cause." Where does it go pray? Bro. H.'s investments are for public good, for the cause, and not for private interests. When any proof to the contrary is presented, it will be time to reply to this unkind and reproachful implication.

I will not say one word, in reference to the plan stated here for the New York Conference. But I must call attention to the estimate in which the two papers are held, and to the object which Bro. N. has before him, viz., to "set the rabbit before the body"—i.e., show the Advent people how much money they are losing through the two Advent offices, which he calls "money making concerns." Let it also be distinctly seen that if the "Herald" is not given up to the body, they purpose to start another paper, &c. "He thinks it folly to put our noses to the grindstone to support two men (Editors of "Herald" and "Harbinger") in pocketing from \$5000 to \$6000 yearly." I have yet to learn that Bro. Himes has invested money to any amount, in any property, for personal ends. He concludes, by declaring that he has no confidence in either "Herald" or "Harbinger," and this with great emphasis.

#### THIRD LETTER FROM G. NEEDHAM.

Worcester, May 13, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—Yours by Bro. Jones was received Thursday evening. I had no time that evening to reply, nor Friday, and Saturday I returned home, where I arrived near ten o'clock in the evening, and sit down this morning dispirited and disgusted, to reply.

We have been betrayed. Bro. Weetsee went

to Lowell and opened his mind to some friends, (without going into details,) as a matter of duty, and Bro. Daniels got hold of it, or some part of it, and, like a stupid fellow, ran with it to Himes. I suppose H. heard of it the day before Conference—it gave him the sick head-ache, but he came into Conference Tuesday morning at the time we were about to begin. Seeing him and several others, we waited a moment for them to be seated, and then some one said something about opening. H. replied, with a look and manner that indicated all that was uttered, "You may if you have any faith in God; for there is no trust in man." Bro. Burnham was called on to pray, and H. followed him in an appeal to God, by way of justification for himself,—instead of a prayer, it was self justification to us, through God. I abhorred it—raised myself up, and found Bro. Burnham had done the same.

H. took every occasion to lead off in abuse of Bro. Marsh, as often as convenient, until Bro. Burnham and myself thought seriously of leaving the Conference; but Bro. Weetsee thought it not best, till we had made an effort to reform. So we all staid through. How much our disaffection towards Elder Himes was known, I cannot tell, but I know he had told some of it. Bro. Pearson, for one, and I think Jones and Osler, at least. I expect a storm, and my poor pate must be pelted. Bro. Weetsee will receive the brunt, but I have pledged myself to him, that if he would stand up like a man, I would stand with him. We purposed to get a private interview with Bro. H., but did not find an opportunity. I felt it my duty to run across H.'s track several times, for his arrogance; and in one instance, I do not know but I wounded him past recovery. Wednesday P. M. was set apart for the consideration of a letter of condolence to sister Miller, when it was understood all the brethren would have an opportunity to speak, who desired.—Meeting opened at two o'clock,—committee were not ready to report, so other business was taken up, and three-quarters of an hour spent, then Bro. Bliss read the letter, occupying fifteen minutes in reading and remarks. Himes then followed, occupying one hour—it was 4 o'clock. Bro. Hale arose to speak, when I arose and reminded him that he would have to be brief, as some dozen brethren wished to speak, and two hours had already been consumed, and only two spoken. *Only one or two others spoke, and it was time for adjournment.* It wounded Himes dreadfully. Well, be it so. His speech was a cunning rider, on the sympathy existing for Father Miller. No honest, pure-minded man, who is above guile, will ever need resort to the throne of grace, and on the popularity of another, in such a way, to sustain himself.

We have got matters into a better shape than I could have ever expected. We have carried a measure that will lay a foundation for better arrangements, and a better understanding among us. Marsh will oppose it, and so would Himes, if he saw it as M. does. But you will see it hereafter. I do not see as we can go far at the next Conference, to establish a new paper—hope it will not be necessary, but fear. We shall go for a committee of investigation of the Tract and Mission fund, and also for a private (i. e. not a Conference) committee of investigation of the charges against Elder Himes. His conduct at New York has almost banished hope that he can clear himself. *This be must do, or be separated from the Advent cause, or I shall separate myself from the man or men who uphold him.* If you can come, do so. I subscribed \$2 to the Mission fund which is not paid yet, and you shall have that towards your expenses. I am exhausted, but hope to recruit in a few days.

Yours,

G. NEEDHAM.

I forbear all comment on this letter, it speaks for itself. I hope it will be read with care.

#### FOURTH LETTER FROM G. NEEDHAM.

Worcester, May 25th, 1850.

MY DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—I returned last evening from Boston with a sad heart. Such a development of depravity, I could never have believed could have been made, for I never could have believed it existed among my brethren, who acted with me. My character, and Bro. Weetsee's, will be destroyed, if they can be. We stand now invulnerable, not to attack, vituperation, falsehood, slander, spite and malignity, to our faces and behind our backs. (This took place in Conference, what out, I do not know, or trouble myself to know), but to anything yet brought against us. The storm of wrath was mainly from Hale, next was Himes, *et id omne genus*. There were some exceptions, yet we had but little sympathy from most of those particularly devoted to Elder Himes. Bro. Robinson, though he said some reprehensible things, yet designed evidently to treat us in a Christian manner. So of Bro. Jones. The occasion of the storm of wrath, was the usual whitewashing resolutions expressing our "unabated confidence in our dear Bro. Himes." I opposed the passage of the preamble and resolution, on the ground that Bro. Himes was not the agent of the Con-

ference [see remarks on 1st letter], that the "Herald" was his own property (see the heading since April 27th), and that he had just published a statement to the world that there was a plot against him, and that a committee of his Church had the matter in hand. I asked the Conference to suspend action till the church had acted, and not by their premature interference, forestall the action of the proper tribunal [compare this with the 1st letter]. This was the substance of my objection. I cast no reflections, nor any insinuations. This opened the scene—and such a scene beggars description. I have no doubt if the most candid description that could be given, were to appear in print, we should all feel ashamed, unless we are past shame. I will say this, the right to defend myself, whenever I claimed it, was not denied me in a single instance—a protest which I handed in was objected to by somebody, who I did not see, with great indignation. In all the confusion, I did not know what became of the protest. The result of two hours' debate was a resolution of the Conference, "into a committee of the whole, to hear charges against Elder Himes." They spent all day and evening, and most of the next forenoon, and when they were through, they knew just as much as they did when they began. It was against this that I protested. I maintained my ground, and by my firmness, and that of the Chardon-street Church, the whole measure was defeated. For this, more than anything else, I have to suffer. The measure was one of the most untimely and unprecedented of all the unaccountable things of these days; and for that reason I would not yield to it. The evidence in the matter could not be produced with such haste and under such circumstances, [Why not, if Bro. N. knew?]; besides, it was taking it right out of the hands of the Church, to whom he had appealed it. This may suffice. If we ever meet, I will tell you all about it. I will add, the charges are now in the hands of the Church committee, and will be attended to in due time. Bro. (for I suppose I may yet call him brother, maugre his unbrotherly treatment) Himes may clear himself from most of them [please notice this admission], but if he does, there must be a radical change in many things, or our co-operation is at an eternal end. I can never put my character into the power of men who have treated me, as some have Bro. Weetsee and myself. [Where has been the cruelty?] I suspend all further remarks till the investigation shall be had. Now a word about yourself. It was said in "committee of the whole," by Bro. Robinson and (I think) Hale, "We have information from Bro. Mansfield, that he has been written to on the subject," and this was brought forward to show that "a conspiracy" was entered into, "plotting" had been going on, "secret workings," and "planning my" and "his ruin" had been done. Is it possible that my Brother Mansfield has given any such information to these men? I cannot believe it—I think there is a mistake, and I know many have been made already—some of which we corrected, but were reiterated, and our statements disregarded. I think Bro. Judson acted very imprudently, and if I credit the statements made in meeting, he told many unauthorized things.

Yours in tribulation, G. NEEDHAM.

Bro. Mansfield, my dear brother, I want you to do me the favor to burn every one of the letters I have written to you of late, i. e., the three last, that there may not be a vestige of evidence that I have written to you on the subject. I do not fear you will divulge it, [how could I keep it after seeing the Pamphlet?] but you will thereby relieve yourself of all difficulty if you should be catechised, as you very likely will be, if you have not already been, on the subject. Moreover, men who can falsify your words, in presence, and after being corrected, do it again, and again being corrected, repeat the misrepresentation the third time, would give a representation to things that would be as false as possible. Put yourself then out of the reach of temptation, and do me a favor. I wrote to you first because I understood Bro. Judson had, and I divulged matters to you, so far as I did, in my first, that you might not be misled by a few insinuations, as it seems you were. I wrote the second at your solicitation, and so of the third. Now, brother, burn them, at my solicitation, and I will be obliged to you.—If I have wronged Bro. Himes in any way, it is in writing to you, for I have written to no other, neither divulged it to another, prior to its divulgment to H. himself. I do not think I did wrong in divulging it, but I do not want to give men who seek to destroy me, even that.

I will relate a fact—you may draw your inference. After I had stood their fire, I mean of the enemy, for twelve hours, the members of that Church greeted me more cordially than any others there! You may preserve the other, if you wish, but please burn this. Yours, G. N.

I have included a few remarks in brackets—have not time for more.

L. D. M.

#### FIFTH LETTER FROM G. NEEDHAM.

Worcester, June 7th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—I have waited with



## SUPPLEMENT

Continued from page 264.

some little anxiety since I wrote last, to hear from you. Not having yet heard, I have concluded to trouble you again. At the Conference, I left seven charges (which the last editorial, by A. Hale, signed J. V. Himes, says, amount to nothing, except one, but which that very same signer said, at the same time, i. e. on Friday last, to the deacons and committee of the Church, were enough, any one of them, to ruin him if proved.) [For an explanation on this point, see remarks on "specifications," 4th and 5th, charge 6th,] which the committee undertook to consider; but Dea. Wood, Dea. West, and Bro. Hamblin, one of the committee, seeing a spirit of disaffection against Bro. Weethee, which seemed to be in the way, consulted together, and finally Dea. Wood and Bro. Hamblin made known to Elder Himes their consultation, and a proposition, that the Elders of the Church, Bro. Himes and Weethee, should meet together, and see what H. had against W., and see if it could not be reconciled. On Friday evening last they met; but lo and behold, he had nothing against Bro. Weethee (?) etc., etc., and at the same time had declared that very day to Bro. Hamblin, that he had something very serious, which will all come out in due time. [For explanation, see Church report.] They could do nothing with him. They accordingly agreed to have another meeting of the officers of the Church, and send for me, and that no other person was to be present. It was expressly understood and agreed upon, and a letter written me accordingly. I put the letter in my hat, and went down.—When I got to the place of meeting, Bliss, Hale, Jones, and Osler, were there, but not Himes.—After they had consumed near an hour about nothing, except a round of preliminaries, manufactured for the occasion, I inquired after the object of the meeting. I was answered by Bliss. I pulled my letter out of my hat, and asked for the reading of it—it was read. This brought the vessel up. The result was, that those men who did not belong to that Church were found to be intruders—that the meeting was a private one, for reconciliation, and not for trial. Here another chapter ended. It was finally agreed expressly, that the meeting adjourn till the next evening, for the same purpose as above, viz., to see if matters could not be reconciled, and that no person out of the Church should be present. But when we came together, Bliss, and Hale, and Bro. Robinson thrust themselves upon us. Himes arose, with another round of preliminaries, manufactured for his own purposes, and having nothing to do with the object of the meeting,—at one moment slinging me all over with adulation, and the next stabbing me to the heart, with venom and malice,—occupying us till nine o'clock, and finally bringing us to a point, for a trial of the case. (This was singular enough, for a defendant to open the case, but so it was.) At this point, I inquired after the object of the meeting. This brought the ship up again. After half an hour's disputation, (in which he laid Dea. Wood in a point blank lie, and which Dea. W. agreed to stand, if convicted. Dea. W. convicted him of the falsehood, by two brethren present, which he passed by with as little ceremony as a man could flit water from his fingers,) we came to a stand point. The effort at reconciliation was abandoned. I required, as a preliminary to that, that the first editorial should be unconditionally retracted, in the "Herald." This, of course, was refused. [See Church report.] Then, said I, we will settle preliminaries for trial. We spent the rest of the evening in disputation on this. It was mutually agreed that the committee,—viz., Bro. Hamblin and Emerson, with the officers of the Church,—should constitute a committee of investigation, to "inquire into the charges." [See Church report.] I then stated my position. "That I now stood in the attitude of *informer* according to the letter of the appeal to the Church, and the statement of it in the 'Herald'; that I did not wish to be considered prosecutor, but still did not absolutely decline, and should they assign me as such, I should consider it, but would rather be excused." For this, Himes abused his "honest man, that will speak the truth," as well as he knew how; not that he seemed to care whether I was the one thing or the other, but that he wanted to make a fuss about everything. After this, I arose to state the case verbally, that he might have the benefit of it, and prepare himself accordingly, designing hereafter to put it in writing. I had proceeded but a few words, when I came to say: "rumor came to my ears, which made a discrepancy between the statements"—I had only half finished the sentence, when Himes sprung upon his feet in the most perfect rage, and demanded the authors of those rumors. I asked him, calmly, to sit down—this I repeated some six or eight times; he continued standing some five minutes, in such a rage of passion, that I do not wonder he has the sick head-ache.

It would be a miracle if he were to escape.—After a calm, but most firm and undaunted refusal, he finally sat down. [See Church report.] I had previously told him, and his friends, that it did not affect the case before us—that it mattered not to the question, if the birds of the air, or a Hottentot of Africa, brought me the news, but I now gave some further reasons why I refused, and reasons which convinced those who, also, thought I ought to give the names; and, finally one of them owned up, but said it would be a gratification. I answered, "That, I well understand. I don't mean to feed that gratification." (I will explain. He thinks Bro. Weethee was my author. He feels towards Bro. Weethee, like the Sea Captain, with whom you came from the West Indies, towards you. He wants to find something against him, so as to change the issue from himself, and turn attention another way. Hence this anxiety, this rummaging the country from one end to the other, to find what Bro. W. has said about him. [The PAMPHLET and these letters will show who has rummaged the country for scandals.] To illustrate: Several families empty their slops in a low place, and in time a stagnant pool is formed. It emits its fetid exhalations, it is true, but still remains. Somebody comes along at last and sticks his cane in and gives it a stir, and immediately the neighborhood is in a stir to know who stuck in the cane. Their anxiety is not to know who put the nuisance there, but who meddled with it.)\* However, I was suffered to go on, amid continual interruptions, and the lowest abuse, till I had said about what I wanted to; and the rest of the evening was spent in angry disputes between Himes and the brethren. I retorted on him, with great severity, several times, for which I afterwards told the brethren I was very sorry. Though I did my duty, in this, it only opened the door for greater abuse from him. I was convinced that nothing but the fear of the lash restrained him at all. As it was, your description of the passion, and low, vulgar abuse, (save the threats of personal violence,) of your Sea Captain, is as befitting a description of the scenes of last Tuesday evening, as I can give. Finally, Dea. West got dreadful angry, at some one of the brethren, and said *there were no charges before them*. He finally moved that the charges before them (just see!) be dismissed as unworthy of notice, and the meeting adjourn without day. *It was put and carried*. Four voted for, two against, and two declined voting, but both being opposed to Himes. One of those who voted for it, is implicated with H. in one of the charges! [See Church report.] Thus ended this chapter. We shall now take an inquest. We can do no less. Their determination is to ruin Weethee and me, if they can; but we do not fear them. Himes is liable in two criminal suits, if he should be complained of. One for opening a letter from Bro. Weethee to his wife, (with no excuse, more than Bro. Clapp would have to take one from you to your wife out of the office and break it open.) [See pages 257-8 of this sheet,] and the other, for helping off Nichols, a rumseller, out of the hands of officers, after he had been arrested. This last is a high criminal offence.† Such men will be reminded, ere long, that they had better take care. A crisis has come, and it is time that every good man took a stand for purity and truth. The more I learn of J. V. Himes' character, the better I know it is full of chicanery. But aside from this, his ungovernable temper renders him unfit for that place. He considers himself the benefactor of every one who may chance to receive anything from him, if it is the money of others. Therefore every man must be his creature. We may as well speak out at once. That Church in Boston, say they have been tyrannized over till they can bear it no longer. This is what he would do over all. His professions are hollow as wind. I know him now. Our brethren will, ere long. Day before yesterday he was raving about somebody (*understood to be yourself*;) who had written him a dreadfully abusive letter. So it goes.‡

\* Declare unto us the parable of the "Stagnant Pool!" The "several families who empty their slops"—are the disaffected, tattling persons, who have retailed scandal in reference to J. V. Himes. The "low place"—is the ready, open ear of the envious person who eagerly drunk in these scandals, and received the garbage from all quarters, until his mind was festered and gangrened. The man who "gave it a stir"—was the one who had a confidential talk about "things in Boston," which stirred up the putrefaction. The "fetid exhalations"—were the flying stories of "dishonesty," "baseness," "chicanery," &c., borne upon the breeze. The "neighborhood in a stir"—were "the tried friends of J. V. Himes," at the Boston Conference. They have now found out where "the low place" is, who "stuck in the cane,"—have discovered the "authors of the nuisance," (see "pamphlet,") and are endeavoring to abate it.—See "Supplement to 'Advent Herald.'"

† These statements of Mr. Himes' agency, in this matter, are sheer fabrications.

‡ This reference to the dreadfully abusive letter, which is understood to be from Bro. Mansfield, gives a specimen of the low, crafty management resorted to for the purpose of receiving the aid of brethren to

Now about the Conference funds. On examination of their accounts, almost the entire amount had gone into his pocket! Some three or four sums of \$5 each had been given to brethren, \$50 was charged for Syracuse meeting—\$20 for tracts at Homer, \$17 for tracts at Syracuse, etc., etc. They did not mean these things should be looked into at all. [See Elder Pearson's letter.] Bro. Turner, of New York, moved, with a crimson blush on his cheek, that the old committee to audit accounts be appointed this year—it was found one was absent, another was nominated—he refused; another—he refused; a fourth—Bro. Weethee, the last man they wanted, (O what a look from Bliss to Himes,) he was chosen! Himes got in a perfect rage at him while in examination.—Brn. Pearson, and Bliss had to hold him back, \* but they were not willing the items should be published. Whether they will be, I know not. So it goes.—Himes, at Conference got upon the impression that he is rich—he ridiculed it—"He must be rich (?) for he was always giving away!" "But how can a man be rich that gives away so much?" etc., etc. These are specimens of a thirty minute harangue. The eyes of his auditors were full of dust—they did not see.—Thus it goes that "Bro. Himes" gives out of his pocket. "Bro. Himes" sustains camp and tent meetings from his own funds, but when the bill is footed, there is a "tract and mission fund" behind. [See Review of Charge 6, Spec. 3d.] It is time the cataract was off the eyes of all our brethren. I thank God for opening mine! It has cost me something, and may more, but I don't value the sacrifice. I wept aloud over my last letter to you, but through the grace of God, my heart has taken a spring and leaped upward again. I must stand it. But I hope there are some brethren who will stand up with me, I think there are. You may act your discretion about showing this letter—You are at full liberty. I rejoice at your meeting at Oswego, would be glad to have been with you. Did not the cause seem to demand, that I should stay here and stand up for the truth, I should be looking for a location in western New York. As it is, God's will be done. I pray God to sustain you, and if in my power, after the first of July, you shall have the funds I mentioned to you before Boston Conference—I think it will be. Love to sister M. Pray for me that I may possess my soul amid such aggravated trials. I expect the "Herald" will groan, this week. Well, God is over all blessed forevermore! If you have written, please write

rally against Elder Himes. Needham, Weethee, Wood, and their partisans, have made it a principal means of their success, to take the words of Elder Himes, if they did not take words he never did use, in speaking of others, and report them to the person spoken of as the reporter wished them to be "understood." (See Weethee's letter to Mansfield, and the testimony on the "trial," in the pamphlet.) They did their greatest mischief in this way, by reporting that in which there was no truth, or that which was not the whole truth.

\* If the improprieties here stated did take place, there are others which are not stated that also took place. Elder Weethee, as one of the committee to audit the Tract and Mission account, gave the Conference to understand, that *he was satisfied* of its correctness, though his proposition to publish it was overruled by the Conference. Mark, now, the "consistency" of their statements out of Conference.—Mr. Himes' "rage," or righteous indignation, was not checked because it was thought he was unreasonable, or Elder W. in danger of violence, but that Elder W. might have full liberty to show himself out. One "fact" will show how much reason Mr. Himes had for his warmth toward Elder W. Among the items of money "disbursed," were twelve dollars, in favor of "A. Hale." (See Bro. Jones' letter.) On coming to this, Elder W. took pencil and paper, and made a minute, in these words: "Twelve dollars paid A. Hale, while at work on the Harp." Elder Himes came near where the committee stood at the moment, and seeing the note in W.'s writing, and understanding its significance, as a charge of fraud on the Tract and Mission Fund, by "taking that amount to pay a man for doing his work," as W. has since reported it, Elder Himes' indignation was stirred.

The "fraud" is of this character. "A. Hale" was employed by Elder Himes to re-arrange the old "Harp," to select and correct hymns for the new "Harp," aided by a committee for that purpose, in the interval of his Sabbath labor, for which Elder Himes was to make his receipts, including what he received for preaching—eight dollars per week. But while this work was being done, on account of over-exertion and exposure to the storms during last year's Boston Conference, sister Hale was prostrated by a severe attack of pleurisy fever. It was extremely difficult to obtain suitable help in his family, and had not sister Southard very kindly tendered her aid, even to the inconvenience of her family, "A. Hale" must have been left alone, with five children, to whom the sixth was shortly added, and a sick wife to take care of. As it was, he could neither *preach nor work on the Harp* for some time. It was during this time that an appropriation of twelve dollars was made for his benefit from the "Tract and Mission Fund."—And this is the fraud! This has been explained to Elder W. Some of our brethren know the facts in the case. We present them to "our brethren at large." "Under no other circumstances should we feel it our duty to take this course."

Other "facts" in the case should be stated. 1st, "A. Hale" has received money, which he has put into that "fund," although he was at liberty to use the same for his own benefit, if he chose. 2d, He never contracted with any man, or body of men, to preach for "ten" dollars a Sabbath, or any other sum; and received five dollars or less, more frequently than a larger sum. 3d, From the number of his family, his state of health, and that he labored exclusively as a "missionary," donors to the "fund" have desired that he might be especially considered: *they never complained!* But it is now discovered, that the "trimvrate, Himes, Hale, and Bliss," are guilty of such awful fraud. "Brethren at large," is it your wish, that your agent should see your brethren "sick, and not visit them?"

again. If you know any of the chicanery such as I spoke of, please let us have it. The country is ransacked from one end to the other, for something to break us down with, and we have got to stand on our defence.—[See Church Report] but after all, God will defend us. \* \* \* I close—may God have mercy, and bless us, and save us. Amen.  
Yours,  
G. NEEDHAM

I replied to Bro. Needham, and expressed dissatisfaction at his course, but did not retain a copy of my letter. Soon after, being advised by some of my most estimable friends to give up the letters of Needham, I addressed him the following letter:

Syracuse, Aug. 9, 1850.

DEAR BRO. NEEDHAM:—Having heard nothing from you for a length of time, I write now to say, that I feel that you have fallen into a great snare in the matter of Bro. Himes. I think that you have been unduly influenced by those whom ENVY had arrayed against Bro. H. and have committed yourself to sustain a wicked and envious movement, and have so involved yourself that you know not how to retrace your steps. The spirit which is now manifested to ruin Bro. Himes at all events, does not savor much of the spirit with which the affair was professedly commenced, when you and W. said: "We are his friends, we do not wish to injure him," &c. The proceeding of Wood in reference to that article, and the spirit manifested in inserting that article in the "Boston Mail," together with the egotistical and Popish sentiments of the article itself, evince to my mind vindictiveness, and a determination to crush Bro. H. at all hazards. I am constrained to view the efforts now making to rake up old charges of ten or twelve years standing against H., as anything but CHARITABLE. Indeed, I do not regard the origin and progress of this effort of W.'s, at all in the light in which I did at first. I think you were misled by W. and some disaffected persons of his church, whose disaffection arose from W.'s suggestions and interrogations, as much as from any other cause. The attempts now made to lead the people to think that W. is the persecuted man, are, in my opinion, anything but ingenious. W. was doubtless the originator of this movement in respect to H.'s delinquency: and for H. to accuse, and even to use severity for circulating these things, (unless they were true, and if true, why not sustain them,) is only acting in self-defence; there is no persecution about it. Suppose you or I had been thus represented, do you think we would have regarded ourselves as persecutors, if we had endeavored to make our accuser prove or confess, or appear to the world as a slanderer?

My brother, you are not so blind as to not see this point. I do hope you will come out and acknowledge your fault in giving so much confidence to these reports, and that you will not persist in your position of hostility to Bro. Himes. You and W. are to publish a pamphlet, it is said!! Consider well before you do it! Ask God in prayer, if love is the mainspring of this movement. I have always loved Bro. Needham, but cannot approve your present course. I (and many others) think that Weethee's ambition has ruined him, and has wrought this mischief in your feelings. I have been anxious to see you either recant, or have a mutual general council appointed to investigate this matter. I have been urgently requested to submit your and W.'s correspondence to a council of brethren; and after prayerful consideration of the matter, and by advice of my most valued Brn. Bates, J. L. Clapp, J. M. Clapp, H. L. Smith, &c., I have become satisfied that duty to Bro. Himes requires it, and I cannot longer refuse to do so, and act upon the principle, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Among the reasons for so doing are the following:

1st. Bro. Himes has all the claims to my confidence and love, which he has had for years,—no tribunal having shown him guilty of those charges, after a suitable time.

2d. The opening up of this subject to my mind was unsought for, and I was not bound to secrecy by any principle of right.

3d. The continuation of the development of this subject, (though sought for by me,) should have been so *truthful*, that to communicate it to H. now, after all that has transpired, would do no harm. For I did not wish you to write charges which were unfounded, nor, especially, to *profess credence* in them. If, therefore, the charges were endorsed by you, and are untrue, (not to intimate that you *knew them to be*;) Bro. Himes should have the opportunity to see them, and refute them.

4th. You had no more right to alienate me from Bro. Himes, by charges without proof, than you had to alienate another person, or all persons.

5th. You have not proved the charges, and have not acted like an *ingenuous* "informant," for you would not tell who his accusers, and the reporters and authors of these stories were.

6th. I am persuaded that SIN was the origin of this crusade against H., and though I do not regard you as prime mover in this work, yet you have lent your influence to it, and it is but just that a council should decide where the blame is—with all the available light before them.

7th. You said in your first letter that "you wished to manage the matter so that Bro. Himes should be injured as little as possible, FOR YOU WERE HIS FRIENDS," but now you and W. manifest a DETERMINATION TO RUIN HIM, and this is to be plainly inferred from your last letters.

8th. Bro. Himes informs me that you and Weethee say that "you have written nothing to question his moral character," and very appropriately suggests—if this be so—the correspondence will only be in your favor; and if it be not so, he ought to know what you say against his moral character. If you, Bro. N., so represent matters, your correspondence must be allowed to speak for itself. I am not bound to shield falsehood. I have acted honestly in this whole affair; and I cannot endorse an untruth for any one.

9th. While the matter stands before the Church at large as it does, I am rather implicated in this attempt to ruin Bro. H., and while I refuse to give up your correspondence, I must be under censure, (and I do not plead guilty to any such charge.) I could illustrate this point by extracts from letters which I have received.



10th. I have to say in conclusion, That you should seek to Bro Marsh and correspond with him against Bro. Himes, after your telling me that "both offices are money-making concerns, and I have no confidence in either," seems very much as though your zeal for right, and to correct the wrong, is not "without partiality," and that personal feelings toward H. prompt to these movements.

If you have any statements to correct in your correspondence, or any reasons to assign—why it is not my duty to submit your letters to a council, please inform me immediately.

With prayer for you to be led aright,

Yours, &c., L. D. MANSFIELD.

The following is his characteristic reply:

SIXTH LETTER FROM G. NEEDHAM.

Worcester, Ang. 13, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—Your extraordinary letter reached here (I suppose) yesterday, but me this morning. I cannot say I was unprepared. Yet not to the extent to which you have gone, or purpose to do. I had designed ere this, to send for my letters to you, but still I could not believe that Bro. Mansfield would violate his own word, and every principle of honor among men, and of Christianity itself, by giving up a private correspondence, and one which I had given to you in confidence, to those who seek my ruin, only because they hope to profit by it.

I believe I allowed you to show my second letter to Bro. Bates, but beyond him not to let it go. My letters since the N. Y. Conference, I care not so much about; still, you have no right to give them up, except by my leave, especially after you have asked me to "repose confidence in my [your] honor and integrity as a man and a Christian." If you dare to do as you purpose, now, what shall I think of your "honor and integrity?"

I have some reasons to give, beside a violation of your pledge, in answer to my first letter, and also to a subsequent one; but before I give them, I request—1st, that my three first letters relating to this matter, be returned to me, immediately. The others, you need not return, unless you choose. But I forbid your giving up, or allowing of the publication of one word of them, to any person or persons, in any way whatever. I hope you have not already done it, but if you have, you will be responsible for it.

2. I think you had better go to some attorney, in whom you have confidence, and lay the matter before him, without mentioning names, so as to act understandingly: for if private correspondence, and that too of the most strictly confidential character, can be published to the world, with impunity, whenever, in the judgment of the repository of it, it is proper, you had better know it; and if not, you had better know it.

I must be very brief on many points in your letter. 1. From the tone of your last letter, I saw you were beginning to take ground against me, in your own mind, and I thought it better to write no more under such circumstances. True, you wished me to write again; so you did when I wrote the first, and had I been as cautious then, you would not have had a confidential correspondence to hand over to a council.

2. You say you think I "have been unduly influenced by those whom envy had arrayed against Bro. H." Well, I think not; and I profess to know more about it than anybody else can. I say further, that the assertion that "envy" had anything to do with the matter, is unworthy of Bro. Mansfield.

3. The first page of your letter entire, is conceived under a misapprehension of the real state of the case. For those who know nothing about the matter, except what they have seen in the "Herald," to be mistaken, is not marvelous: but for those who have been advised, somewhat, to be in darkness, is passing strange. Why will you not wait, till you hear from us? I do not want to "retrace my steps." What do you know about "the spirit that is manifested to ruin Bro. Himes"? You have neither seen or heard anything from us for weeks. All you have seen, except the Church expose, in answer to what appeared in the "Herald," the week before, is on the other side. I hope you do not judge us, by the spirit you see there! I plead an eternal separation from that spirit.

4. We have not "raked up old charges, of ten or twelve years standing." Mr. Himes himself "raked up" an "old" matter, of some fourteen "years standing," and brought it forward in Church meeting, which most of the Church had never heard of before. He gave his version of it, but we, having learned the man, thought best to look below the surface. We did so, and the result will be known soon. But for his own action, we should never have meddled with it. [See Warner's second letter and Buf-fam's case.]

5. No "attempt" has been "made to lead the people to think W. is a persecuted man." This is news to me.

6. You come to "the point" now. You "hope you [I] will come out and confess your [my] fault, in giving so much confidence to these reports"? Yes, Bro. Mansfield, you shall see my confession in full, if God will, in a few days. You will be better able to understand my "fault," then.

7. Bro. W. and I "are to publish a pamphlet!"? Yes, Bro. Mansfield, and no surprise, either. Can it be? Bro. Mansfield can tamely look on, and see the man he has "always loved," blackened, as black as falsehood, iterated and reiterated from week to week, for THIRTEEN weeks, minus only one in the time, can make him; he can see Churches in different parts of the land, some of whom have known us, and some who never saw us, but whose confidence we enjoyed, in violation of all law, human and divine; in violation of all order, all gospel; trampling under foot all right, all justice, the office of the ministry, the institutions of Christ's house; acting on these slanderous reports, fulminated to perhaps twenty thousand readers; taking up the scandal thus furnished them, and sending back their fulminations; and yet he is surprised that we are going to vindicate ourselves! Would to God, Bro. Mansfield was in a similar place six hours! I would ask no more! My eyes would not now run down with tears, in view of the attitude towards me, of the man who has "always loved" me, and whom I have always loved. No, no. O, Bro. M., I beg of you stop—if you have

not already gone too far. Must the tie be forever severed, that has bound us these seven years? If you do it, remember, you alone will be accountable.

8. But you have come to the conclusion, after "prayerful consideration of the matter, and by the advice of your most valued friends, to submit our correspondence to a council of brethren!" Can it be possible! "After prayerful consideration," you have concluded to violate the following pledge, unqualifiedly given. "As to keeping this matter secret, you may be assured that I could not do otherwise, for our enemies and the enemies of our blessed cause, would say, 'Ah! so would we have it.'" Prayer never led a man to violate the sanctity of confidential correspondence, nor his word. No, never! I would sooner burn at the stake than do it.

I cannot notice all the reasons, you have given, to justify you in such a step, but the law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is the starting point.

1. Well, am I your neighbor? Will love to me, or to yourself, lead you to violate every principle of the gospel, and your own pledge?

2. But love to Mr. Himes, you say, prompted you. Well, let us look at this. What benefit will it be to him? will it alter a single fact in his case? Suppose we have, (as is slanderously reported,) entered into a conspiracy against Mr. Himes—and suppose our ruin could be effected, would these clear or condemn him?

3. But if I have done wrong, in writing to you and stating some of the facts, which have since been proved, to whom did I wrong him? To yourself alone, obviously. Very well, then you, and you alone, have a complaint against me. Mr. Himes has none, and can have none, unless the matter goes from yourself. While you keep it, he can know nothing about it, and consequently can have no complaint. Allow, then, that I have wronged him by publishing the matter, to whom did I publish it? To you alone, or if any farther, to Bro. Bates. If it has gone beyond that bound, it has gone not only against my own express inhibition, but your most solemn pledge, and you and Bro. Bates are responsible for it; and I shall so hold you.

4. I say, then, if there is wrong, it lies between you and me, (unless you have published the matter,) but there is an axiom in law, that "a man can never take advantage of his own wrongs." Come, then, to Worcester, if you have a matter against me; and if we cannot settle it between ourselves, we will submit it to the Church, of which I am both a member, and pastor.

But there is to be a council of brethren, eh? Do you suppose I shall acknowledge any such bodies? Self-called and self-constituted councils, truly! And so private correspondence is to be submitted to some Pope-called, or self-called and constituted body, to be passed upon? Pause, my brother, pause! Be not accessory to such a measure! You have been unduly influenced, or you would never have thought of such a high handed step. I repeat, come to Worcester, or send to our clerk, Bro. F. R. Mayers, and I will hear the church. We have a regularly constituted church, and my name stands on their list of members. I do and shall acknowledge the authority of the church, but that of no other body. Worcester church has seen with deep regret and indignation the Popish and impertinent interference of other bodies, condemning their Pastor unseen and unheard, (what a heathen government would not do,) and they mean to speak out. Their voice will be heard soon, if they can find a medium. They think they can take care of their own members without any foreign aid; and they mean to do it. These bulls of the different churches are most high handed, and will yet be estimated in their own light. Deeply do I pity them, who, by passion or otherwise, have thus in their hot haste, taken the place of the Great Head of the church. I pray God the sin may not be laid to their charge.

9. It would lengthen out this communication far too long, to even glance at your ten reasons for trampling under foot the Lord's command in the 18th of Matt., as well as your own solemn pledge, but I notice in the 8th, as a reason, that Mr. Himes informs you, "that you [me] and Weetsee say that you [we] have written nothing to question his moral character." I do not know what Bro. Weetsee may have said about that, but presume if he said so he told the truth, for you are the only one that I ever heard him speak of writing to; and as to myself you are the only person I ever wrote, or spoke to, on the subject, save Bro. Weetsee and Judson, till after Mr. Himes himself, published it far and wide. But I never denied or intimated any such thing, but on the contrary, to friends in whom I could confide, I have uniformly owned, (when I had a mind to) that I had written to one person, and only one on the subject, without naming any thing in particular that I wrote or did not write. Before the church, I also stated that I had written to you, inquiring about the expenses of the Tent meeting. In regard to myself, therefore, the assertion is a gratuitous falsehood, like a hundred others that have appeared in the organ of slander at Boston, of late.

10. Your 9th reason is a curiosity. How came "the matter before the church at large?" [Mr. Judson told it.—L. D. M.] You are the only living being to whom I wrote a word, or opened my mouth, prior to the N. Y. conference. Are you "the church at

\* It will be seen that the reason which I assigned, is, lest it should reach our enemies and hurt the cause. But he has now given publicity to ALL THE SCANDAL POSSIBLE against Bro. Himes,—and still claims that my promise is binding!!! I did not expect to be the "repository" for SCANDAL, and then charged with a want of "honor," for doing as I would be done by!!!

L. D. M.

† Did Bro. Needham suppose that I could lose my confidence in Bro. Himes, and regard him as the "base," "dishonest" man which these letters represent, and yet continue to hold friendly intercourse and correspondence with him? Did he expect me to lie for him, and deny having received letters, when asked by Bro. Himes? He says he only wronged Bro. Himes "to me and Bro. Bates." Well, Bro. Bates advised me to send the letters to Bro. Himes.

L. D. M.

large? or have you published it to "the church at large?" I am clear in this matter, beyond yourself. Let the responsibility rest where it belongs!

11th, I pass over your charges of falsehood. I find them in several places. \* \* \*

12. With regard to my correspondence with Bro. Marsh, I suppose that is my own business. In regard to what I said about the offices, I had no reference to their disinterested benevolence, (as the connexion shows,) for I never, for a moment supposed Bro. Marsh was dishonest in his deal with his fellow men. But it is true that both offices have made money. I say it freely, to day, with all proper respect for Bro. Marsh. That I misapprehended Bro. Marsh, I am sensible, and have been for some time. But I wrote to him some time since, on that subject, and if he is not satisfied, he will let me know it, I doubt not.

I conclude by saying, Mr. Himes has had a regular trial before his Church, and been found guilty on all the charges, and the Church have withdrawn the hand of fellowship, until he repent. To this I say Amen. This cry about "peers" will avail nothing. He got a committee of his Church appointed by his own request, and subsequently that committee was enlarged by mutual agreement and consent, so as to include the officers of the Church, then—it being the understanding of them all, (I having asked the question no less than three times, if it was so understood, and no objection being made, I also remarking that I did not care which way they had it, and Mr. Himes' friend Emerson saying if it was not so enlarged, he should decline serving,) I say then, they proceeded to act as a committee, and subsequently voted to "dismiss the charge as unworthy of consideration, and adjourn sine die." This vote was carried by his friends, whose names are now paraded, as the echo of all he wishes to say, in that manner. Nobody else expected such a move, or desired it, so far as I know. Moreover, one of the two "enemies" (?) who voted against it, told him on the spot, that he did so, because he thought it would be the worst thing for him (Himes) that could have been done.—Yet we are made to bear all this, and I am implicated in it, and unwilling to meet the charges, which I preferred! All this, and an abundance more of the same sort, Bro. Mansfield believes, and it furnishes him with a justification for a purpose to commit one of the grossest outrages that a man could well do! I never refuse to act as prosecutor. I asked that committee to secure me, yet remarked, "if you should appoint me I would consider it." When the Church finally appointed me prosecutor, I should have positively refused, but for the perversion that has been made of my former request. I had too much reason to expect a like perversion, if I refused. But the trial has been had; and his withdrawal of himself, has availed nothing. He was notified to appear, and would have had full and ample opportunity to rebut the testimony, had he done so, but he refused, and the trial went on without him. We have been threatened with prosecution, at almost every step, both by the man who is willing to "bare his bosom to investigation," and his friends. But we think we understand our business. We have not moved in this matter without legal advice.

You wish to know, in conclusion, if there is any thing in my statements to you, which I wish to correct. I answer, I kept no copy of my correspondence with you. I supposed I was writing to a man in whom I could confide. [As a repository for scandal!—this was a mistake, as all now see. You should have known me better.] But, I should like to see the three first letters, that if there is any thing that is not strictly and exactly correct, in them, I may correct it, for your benefit; and the one I allowed you to show to Bro. Bates, for his benefit: But beyond that I have no responsibility. If you have violated confidence, in publishing them, you must see to that.—And as to councils, the laws of Massachusetts will protect me from all such self constituted tribunals.—They recognize my relation to the Church, or any other association, to which I voluntarily give my name: But they say to all intruders of that kind, "Let alone!" You will therefore understand, that if those for whom "the law is made" (Rom. 13) do not incur its penalty, it will be from clemency. I repeat, that if you or any other brother has any thing against me that I cannot satisfy personally, I will most cheerfully submit it to the Church, of which I am a member: but all self-constituted tribunals may learn to their cost, that their intermeddling is high handed business.\*

I do hope, Bro. M. you will not be hasty, (but I much fear the deed is already done) but return the letters as I propose, and I will take legal advice, and then if you persist in your purpose, to give up my correspondence to others, I will make known my ultimate decision. I hope however, it will not come to this. I hope I shall never have to withdraw my fraternal feelings from Bro. Mansfield. In a blessed hope waiting for the Lord from heaven,

G. NEEDHAM.

REMARKS.

I replied to this letter, but kept no copy. The substance was—I could not comply with his request to return the letters; and as to his threats of prosecution, he ought to know me better than to suppose I could be intimidated from doing what I thought duty by such means. On reaching Boston, I addressed the following to Bro. Needham:

Boston, Sept. 6th, 1850.

BRO. NEEDHAM:—I reached this city last evening, and shall spend a few days here, in which I shall feel it my duty to arrange your correspondence for publication, in order to illustrate, as far as possible, the nature of the movement against Bro. H.

I write now to say, that as the matter should be all fairly represented, I wish to publish my letters to you, if you desire it, in their appropriate places. So you will send me either the letters, or copies of them, and they shall be returned. Will you forward them

\* And yet the "Cochituate Hall Church" tries and excommunicates the pastor of the Chardon-street Church, helped by the pastor of the Worcester Church. What kind of "business" is this "intermeddling"? Is it not "high handed?" "Thou that sayest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?"—Rom. 2:21.

to me at your earliest convenience, by mail or express? Direct to me, 8 Chardon-street.

Your and Weetsee's efforts against Bro. H. will, I fear, be suicidal, but more of Himes's than of Samson's. I am much shocked at your "pamphlet." It evinces the most fixed and determinate purpose to bury Bro. Himes, without the hope of a resurrection. But your "pamphlet" will not effectuate that. The condemnation of the Church of Cochituate Hall will affect some, perhaps, but not me. I had no doubt that they would condemn, as the charges came from them: they must condemn him, or themselves.

You who have collected together all public and "confidential" matters relating to Bro. Himes, for the purpose of totally ruining him, will have no occasion to complain if I shall use not only public, but "confidential" matters, to show the origin and grand idea in this movement against H., for the purpose of saving him for the cause, which he has so long and faithfully served.

I am sorry to be compelled to do this, but I cannot see Bro. H. sacrificed at the shrine of selfishness and malignity, without throwing all the light upon the subject in my power. Yours, L. D. M.

In reply, I received the following, in the handwriting of Bro. Needham, from the portion of the Worcester Church to which he preaches:

ELDER L. D. MANSFIELD:—Dear Bro.:—Having seen it several times stated in the "Herald," that Elder G. Needham, our pastor, had sometime previous to the Conference in May last, written letters to some one, which revealed "a conspiracy," or "plot," on the part of certain individuals, of which he was one, against the character of Elder J. V. Himes; and having heard it repeatedly asserted in this city, and in our Church meetings, that yourself was the individual to whom he had written; and having seen it stated in the last "Herald," that "Elder N. has written to one with whom he corresponded, requesting that he would burn his letters!"; accompanying the statement with a charge of "duplicity and cunning"; and having learned from Bro. Needham that he had sent a request to you for the three first of those letters, that if there was anything that was not "strictly correct," he might correct it for your benefit; and that in a subsequent letter, you have refused to return them: We, the Church of Second Advent believers in Worcester, (to the oversight of which Bro. N. was called as Pastor, nearly a year and a half ago, and in which capacity he has continued to the present time,) do now join him in a second request, that those letters, viz., the three first, and the one containing the request that the others should be burned, be returned to him, for the purpose of being laid before this Church. If those letters contain evidence of wrong doing, on the part of Bro. Needham, the Church of which he is Pastor, have a right to that evidence. If they do not, they have a right to know it. We think you cannot refuse so reasonable a request, so long as yourself have, in some way, authorized the above reports. If this request is refused, we shall take it for granted, that there is no foundation for them, and must let the responsibility rest where it belongs. We shall expect that you will retain a copy if you choose.

With sentiments of respect, we are yours, &c.

Resolved, That the above be signed by the Pastor and Clerk, and sent to Bro. Mansfield, for his consideration, and compliance.

G. NEEDHAM, Pastor.  
BENJ. B. HILL, Clerk.

P.S. It is but just to say, that the joint letter was prepared several days ago, but we could not be turned aside for any of your purposes or plans—that testimony belongs to my Church, and they ought to have it. I received your letter from Boston, yesterday, and will only say, it will be time enough for you to ask for your letters, when you treat me and my people with courtesy. If you think I fear to meet any thing contained in the first two or three letters, in a proper way, you are much mistaken. As to subsequent ones, if Mr. Himes wants to publish them, very much, I will furnish him with much more of the same sort, if those do not satisfy him. I can furnish any quantity of matter he may want for his defence, if such correspondence will prove a defence. G. N.

I was glad to receive this letter, with Bro. Needham's postscript, as it admits my obligation to "submit the matter to a council;" i. e., a sort of council—"his Church." But the Advent Church at large have now had Bro. Himes' private conversations, &c., collected and spread out before them—therefore they must hear the other side—this is fair. It will be seen by my reply, that I endeavored to "treat him and his Church with courtesy." I am sorry to see the vindictive spirit manifested in the above postscript. The following was my reply:

Boston, Sept. 12, 1850.

To Elder Needham's Church in Worcester: DEAR BRETHREN:—Your letter came duly to hand, but my engagements have prevented me from answering you sooner. You will pardon the delay.

In reference to your request, I will only say, that it will not be consistent for me to give up to others the original letters of Bro. Needham. This I cannot do for any one. I have made copies of those letters, which have been used by the compositors, and are too much soiled to be sent you; but I will soon send you a printed sheet containing copies of those letters, carefully compared with the original letters in proof reading, which I shall certify, and these will answer your purpose.

I will say, I do not, however, recognize the "right" of the Church to those letters, as Bro. Needham affirms in his postscript. The letters belong to me;—no one else can have them. I will, however, for the satisfaction of the Church, show the original letters to a committee, if they choose to appoint one; but for all practical purposes, the printed copies will be sufficient in the investigation of this matter.

Yours very truly, L. D. M.

P.S. I shall be in Boston, until Monday, and shall then return Westward. If you have any other communications, address me here.

The following letter was received from Elder Weetsee, as per date, and is inserted here:



## ELDER WETHEE'S SECOND LETTER.

Boston, June 11th, 1850.

DEAR BRO. MANSFIELD:—You perhaps are desirous of hearing how matters are going at this place. They are so intricate that I can scarcely tell you I may be obliged to publish the whole matter after a while. My suspicions of his character are becoming more confirmed. I write you that you should return my letter which I wrote you with your certificate connected that that letter was received before the New York Conference, so as to identify it. It is important that I should have it and it will not affect you. Send it immediately, or if you have destroyed it, then send me what you remember of its contents, especially where I stated that there were to be no charges at the New York conference. That some things had already been explained, and I was in hopes that the whole matter might be amicably adjusted. These are important points. He has spoken to me severely against you, as one for whom he had done so much, please send me an account of his treatment towards you as I am collecting facts. State nothing only as you would be willing to testify before court. The thing is taking a wide range. He has challenged all men. He is resolved to have clean papers from my church but will not get them without a strong protest accompanied with the reasons, and a full history of his course and acts. Send me any information which will be of any use. I should like to know more of the expenses of the Syracuse meeting. He has charged the tract and mission fund 50 dollars, I insisted that he should publish the disbursements for the last year but cannot get him to do it as yet. Things here are certainly dark. The Boston Conference was composed of his tried friends, drummed up from the various churches, and I was treated more like a dog than a brother. Write me as soon as possible.

Yours, J. P. WETHEE.

## REMARKS.

It will be seen by the above letter, that there had been a previous one written. This I returned, as here requested. That letter was written with caution, but yet contained evidence of the purpose to get a representative Conference for their own purposes—viz., to establish a paper. I did not then see the *iniquity* of the scheme as I saw it afterwards, and see it now. The readers of this article will not readily perceive how much Elder Wetthee was implicated in this matter, unless they consider that Elder Needham's impressions were made by him, (Wetthee,) as appears in the letters of Elder N.

As to the publication of the Missionary and Tract Fund account, Bro. Himes did not refuse to publish. But it seemed to be the opinion of the Conference, that it was not best to publish the report. The account was audited by persons appointed by the Conference, and found correct.

I would now say, in conclusion, that I deeply regret the necessity which has been imposed upon me to give publicity to these letters; nothing but the most satisfactory evidence of the *wrong intentions*, and the present *bitter hatred* of the actors in this affair, (evidenced by the pen, dipped in gall, which traced the pages of the late pamphlet, and these letters also,) toward yourself (Bro. Himes), could have made me willing to do as I have done. With these remarks, I submit the whole matter.

With assurances of unfeigned regret, that you have been thus persecuted, and betrayed, and hated, and almost ruined,

I am, my dear Bro. Himes,  
Yours truly, L. D. MANSFIELD.

ERRATA.—In Elder Needham's first letter, 5th paragraph, 5th line, instead of "not knowing it till all is ready," read, "not knowing till all is ready." Same par., 14th line, for "he proposed to buy," read, "he proposed to buy." Second letter, 1st par., 6th line—For, "bring forward general measures," read, "some general measures." Same par., 3d line from top of next col.—For "many cases," read, "many cases." Second par., 5th line—For "endorsed notes," read, "endorsed notes at the bank." Third par., 14th line—For, "But said he and his family," read, "But said he, his family." Fifth par., 13th line—For, "(if it is all paid up)," read, "(and it is all paid up)." The following errors appear in only a few copies. Second letter, 5th par., 17th line—For, "Two hundred," read, "Four hundred." 3d and 4th lines below—For, "As you see," and "one per cent," read, "As you see," and "one cent." Sixth par., 3d line—For, "in conversation," read, "in connection."

The foregoing History and Correspondence show the movement which was on foot in the dark. Let the readers carefully compare the several features thus developed, with the corresponding points in the following article, which was the principal instrument in calling the attention of brethren to the dark deeds which were being consummated, and bringing them to light. Let them read and compare, and then say, was it uncalled for? was there no justification for the suspicions!—no necessity for the warning? Now that a full development has been made, and the dark conspiracy has been partially unfolded, it may be well again to read the article which caused such heart-burnings, and was pronounced so unjust.—See "Herald" of May 18th, 1850.—We have reason to believe that there is more correspondence of a still blacker character still in the dark.—It may yet come out.

## MORE SECRET WORKINGS.

To the tried and faithful friends of the Advent cause:—BRETHREN:—At the Conference lately held at New York, intimations were made to me by brethren from different parts of the country, which were of a character and relate to matters, which appear to make it indispensably necessary that I should speak as I am about to do in this article. No other course seems to be left to me but to speak in this public manner, since I know not how far this affair has spread, only that brethren separated from each other by more than a hundred miles have appeared at the late Conference, in possession of more or less of a knowledge of some secret work of darkness about to be attempted.

"The features and object of this attempt, so far as made known by those who have had the brotherly and Christian honor to lay this matter, which so seriously involves my integrity, usefulness, and happiness, before me, appear to be as follows: 1. A most cruel and unrighteous attempt on my personal character, by stating things to my injury in which there is no truth; by reviving old and often refuted slanders, and by writing letters and making journeys for the purpose of favoring and directing this attack on me by brethren generally. 2. The securing (as they call it,) of the 'Herald' office and its appendages to the Advent cause, in case of my decease. 3. To effect a change in reference to those who are associated

with me in the management of the paper and office. What else there may be in contemplation, has not been developed, even in the most remote degree.

"Now, I have only to say, to my brethren and to all men, what I have so often said before, that if any man has aught against me, of any kind whatever, I am prepared to meet it in the manner they shall choose, and at any time or place they prefer. 2. In reference to securing the Advent 'Herald' and its interests to the Advent cause, I am prepared to carry into effect the proposition I have so often made, that whenever, in the judgment of the tried and faithful friends of the cause, such a transfer of our Advent organs, and any other appropriations for the cause which brethren generally see fit to make, as will secure a more efficient and satisfactory promotion of the work, is advisable, let the arrangement be made, I am ready for it. There is, however, a proper way to do all things that are proper to be done. The securing of what belongs to the cause, for the purpose to which it is devoted, and the attempted destruction in the favor and esteem of his brethren, of a man who, as to anything that appears, has shown as much willingness to sacrifice for it as any other one, are very different things. If the fear that I may be 'taken away' without providing for the cause as I may have the means, or without doing justice to my responsibilities; if sympathy for me under the loss of such a measure of health as permits me now only to perform even less than those may do who are so sympathetic; if these are reasons why something should be done by my brethren to secure the cause, or some other cause, the valuable service and interest of the 'Herald,' are these sufficient reasons for a cruel, unchristian and unbrotherly attack upon my integrity?

"Why so much more anxiety should be felt to secure the 'Herald' than any other Advent paper, and some other questions, I must leave unnoticed at this time. But if this, only, were the object to be secured, how is it that those who are so deeply concerned for the cause, should find it inconvenient, or deem it improper, even to consult me in any way about it? Have I never had any interest for the cause? or have I lost it all? This becomes still more mysterious, and painful, if, as is intimated, those who are the prime movers in this, have been in daily, or frequent intercourse with me. I do not shrink from any investigation. But will my brethren see that justice is done me? I ask for nothing more! I have sufficient confidence in the wisdom and justice of those who have stood by me thus far, to submit all my affairs into their hands.

"I have requested of the Church of which I am a member, that a committee be appointed to inquire into reports involving my moral character. The result will be made known. In the mean time I wish my brethren to put a few questions to those who circulate reports to my injury: 1. What do you know Bro. Himes to be at fault in? 2. Will you hold yourself responsible to sustain your statements? 3. Have you taken the course pointed out in the Gospel towards one against whom a brother has aught?

"These questions are proper in all cases. Those who decline to answer them are not only my enemies; but the enemies of the Gospel of Christ, and of all men.

"With those who prejudge me to be unworthy of confidence, and privately circulate reports to my injury, when they have it within their power on any day to know the truth in the case, I desire to have nothing to do, either as their agents, or as men whom it would be possible to satisfy. With those who have confidence in me, and see fit to labor with me still, I shall have no difficulty in arranging the mode of operations, or in giving them at any time a satisfactory account of my stewardship. J. V. HIMES.

"The following is from Bro. J. Pearson, Jr., one of the sources of information on which the above remarks are made:

"Bro. HIMES:—I am greatly grieved to learn that reports detrimental to both your Christian and moral character are widely circulated among the brethren. As they are having the effect to injure your influence and curtail the usefulness of the 'Advent Herald,' it demands your prompt action.—Therefore have I deemed it a duty I owe to you and the cause of truth, to call your attention to the matter; that you may at once check the spread, and destroy the effect, of this one more effort of the enemy of all good to mar the work of God."

## THE MOCK TRIAL.

Having given our readers a history of the commencement and progress of the "Secret Workings," we are prepared to examine the charges; and the evidence by which it is claimed that they are sustained.

To properly appreciate the judgment arrived at, it is necessary to consider the tribunal before which the testimony is presented. Do any imagine an assembly of grave, praying men, bowing in agony of soul before the Mercy Seat, pleading that God would reclaim an erring brother? Do they fancy they see them listening with pain at each successive development of crime?—hoping that in some way they may vindicate his injured name, and "remove the clouds which lower over his pathway"?—and if they find him erring, more anxious to convert than to convict? Let none picture such a scene. On the contrary, behold a company of disaffected men, determined to crush a brother. Behold their pastor, going from place to place, collecting accusations of assumed wrong doing. He had seen Mordecai sitting at the king's gate, and when he saw that he bowed not to his opinions\* nor did him reverence, he was full

\* Elder W. had great expectations respecting a movement which was to be made by a body to be symbolized by the "third angel," in Rev. 14:9. His view is hinted at on p. 149 of his "Armageddon." More than a year since he told Bro. Bliss, and Eld. Robinson testifies that he told him the same, on another occasion,—that a movement corresponding with that symbol, as the Advent movement did with the

of wrath, and determined to see whether Mordecai's matters would stand; for he had told them that he was a Jew. And he thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone; for they had showed him the people of Mordecai, and he sought to destroy them throughout all the kingdom. He goes to work secretly to prejudice the minds of his ministering brethren.—They, believing his statements, are partially affected. He pledges them to secrecy—not to let his brother know of his purpose till the time should come when he might crush him. This plot is detected. The brethren are put on their guard. He miserably fails. His church hearing that they are implicated as the authors of the charges against one of their brethren, desire to give an indignant denial, that they in any way participate in them. Their pastor returns.—He knows that if they declare their disconnection, he will be placed in a bad predicament.—He, and the one or two who have been privy to his purposes, go to work to defeat any investigation. They offer to the injured brother, to give him "clean papers" if he will clear "Wetthee." Clean papers are not what are wanted; justice is sought for. The brother must know the author or authors of those reports. He is told "if you press that, you shall have enough of it. They will find those who will swear to anything." Still the cry is, "Justice! justice; give me justice." The first set of charges brought, are not to the minds of their authors, or the time has not arrived for their examination. By unheard of assumptions of rules of order, and dictatorial decisions of order, their trial is evaded. The pastor pleads innocence and great persecution. Floods of tears run down his cheeks, which excite the sympathetic portion of his flock, whom he assiduously visits, and, under various pleas, he succeeds in securing six disaffected men and one boy from among the male members of the Church, and a larger number of females—with five men and several females, who were hurried by him into the Church while the difficulties were pending, or after they removed—being voted in, each within five minutes after being first proposed—as his defenders. These withdraw from the Chardon-street Chapel, and open a meeting in another place. They declare themselves to be the Chardon-street Church; and the Church and society that remain, elopers. Having separated themselves from all of Bro. Himes' friends, under the borrowed name of the Church they have departed from, they qualify themselves to sit as *impartial* judges; how? Do they agree that they will judge according to the law, and the testimony, and render exact justice between man and man, according to the best of their judgment? O, no! They do it by adopting the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Elder J. V. Himes be required by this Church to withdraw the charges and accusations contained in the article in the 'Herald' of May 18th, headed 'More Secret Working,' as far as they have any bearing on the conduct of J. P. Wetthee."—p. 50.

Might it not well be said:

"O judgment! thou art fled to brutish beasts,  
And men have lost their reason."

Having shown their impartiality by condemning in advance,—in the above resolution, of which requirement they gave their intended victim no knowledge, until they had pronounced him convicted, and published to the world their decision,—this pastor, six adult members, one minor, and five new members, then constituted seven of their number "a committee to search out and investigate the nature of those complaints [which the pastor had been collecting and circulating, and prepared all to their hands] in circulation, which, if true, are injurious to his moral and Christian character."—p. 51. This committee consisted of M. Wood, Chairman; J. G. Hamblin, J. W. Young,\* S. A. Porter,\* S. Mills, L. J. Seavy, Thos. Allecott,\*—the first of whom, if not more, were connected with the pastor in the circulation of the charges. The three with stars were of those who were hurried into the Church; and the last, one of those added after they left the Chapel! Elder Needham, the one the most identified with Elder W. in the attempt to ruin Bro. Himes, is appointed Church Advocate! i. e., to advocate the cause of this fragment of a Church, before itself, and induce them to convict Elder H. of charges made by themselves. Was not such a tribunal fitted to the work to be done by it?—and the work done, the fit product of such a tribunal? They proceed by issuing the following cita-

first angel, was to be made; that when it should be made, it would be greater than the Advent movement was; that the Adventists might be that body if they would; but that if they declined, another body would take their places. To forward this movement, it is supposed, was the great motive which first induced him to attempt to get control of the "Herald," that he might divert it to his own purposes. Those conversing with him got the impression, that he expected to head the body to be symbolized by the third angel. Elder Marsh told Elder Himes the year previous to that, that Elder W. claimed to be represented by that angel.

tion, to which was sent the accompanying reply:—

"To ELDER J. V. HIMES.

"The undersigned, being a committee appointed by the Church of which you are a member, have been directed by the Church aforesaid, to SEARCH OUT AND INVESTIGATE the nature of those complaints in circulation, which, if true, are injurious to your moral and Christian standing.

"Acting under our instructions, we have considered such complaints, and have reduced them to seven general heads, a list of which charges we now transmit to you, and hereby cite you to appear before the Church aforesaid, at the house of M. Wood, in Gardiner street, on Thursday evening, the 1st of August, 1850, to answer the complaints herein specified. Respectfully, M. Wood, Chairman; J. G. Hamblin, J. W. Young, S. A. Porter, S. Mills, L. J. Seavy, Thos. Allecott.

"THE GROUNDS OF COMPLAINT.—1. That Elder J. V. Himes has evinced in his management of the Second Advent Publications and the property and funds derived from the same, a want of economy, openness, and candor, and unbending integrity, so essential to a Christian, and more especially to one who has called himself a "GENERAL AGENT" of the Second Advent Body.

"2. That he has treated various brethren in the ministry, in matters of public notoriety, (not between two private persons, as such,) in a manner unbecoming a Christian.

"3. That Elder J. V. Himes has treated certain officers of Chardon-st. Church and Society, (heretofore known by that name,) and private members, and others of like faith, in an improper manner, and highly derogatory to his Christian standing.

"4. That in his course, as pursued, in relation to Church organization in general, and especially as exhibited in the Second Advent Cause in Boston, from its commencement, he has evinced a want of consistent, unbending, Christian principle, and strict moral integrity.

"5. That in secular dealings J. V. Himes has been wanting in that scrupulous integrity, and deep moral principle, so necessary to every Christian, and especially to a minister, and still more to one looking for the return of Jesus.

"6. That J. V. Himes has been wanting in that scrupulous regard for TRUTH, which should distinguish every Christian.

"7. That he has treated the Church of which he is a private member, in the manner unbecoming a man in the possession of that humility required in the Gospel."

## HIS REPLY.

"To M. WOOD AND OTHERS:—In reply to a citation from you, to answer charges before you, as specified in your letter received this morning, I remark that if you, or any one have any matters of complaint against me, I will at any time most cheerfully give you a hearing before an impartial council of my peers, or the Church of which I am a member; but you are not recognized as a committee appointed by any church of which I am a member; nor as "impartial" men, competent to sit in judgment on charges originating with yourselves. If you wish to settle any difficulty on principles of Christian equity, no obstacle will be placed before you, but every facility offered—notwithstanding the strange and unaccountable course you have chosen to pursue. But if you decide to continue in this crusade against me, the field is open before you; and you can take the course you may deem will best subserve your ends. J. V. HIMES.

Boston, July 31, 1850."

The first set of charges which had been presented by Elder Needham, (see "Herald" of July 6th,) had been abandoned, and these substituted in their places. Friday evening, Aug. 2d, was the important moment, which, in the expectation of the parties concerned, was to consign Elder J. V. Himes to the shades of oblivion. They met as per adjournment, in Cochituate Hall, self-styled—"The Supreme Church of God on earth;" also, "the highest earthly tribunal." We have read the trial of Charles I, before the High Court of Justice—with seventy judges. We have been familiar with that of Warren Hastings before the Peerage of the British realm. But not yet have we had a graphic description of the one under consideration. The pens of both poet and historian, and the pencil of the painter have been called into requisition to perpetuate those former displays. Of this, the simple result is all that is yet revealed. Those former august tribunals were in the great Hall of William Rufus, which has resounded at the inauguration of thirty kings. There was not wanting the pomp of civil or military display. The peers robed in gold and ermine; the judges of the law, in their vestments of state, and the ambassadors of great kings, and eloquent advocates, were there present. The wit, and wisdom, and learning, of the realm were there arranged; every movement, word, and look, are matters of great interest to those who have come after them. The gravity and dignity of the judges, the noble bearing of the accused, the vastness of the audience, the rank of the parties present, all gave importance to the occasion. The stillness that reigned in the intervals of the trials, the attention of all to every changing occurrence, the bright glances from many glistening eyes, the silent curl of many a ruby lip, the bending low of many a listening ear, to catch each uttered sound, the expressive countenances, watching the progress of the trial, as the varying fortune of the accused, or eloquence of the advocates, caused the auditory to alternate between hope and fear; these have all been depicted in rainbow tints, or in beautiful and eloquent description. Shall not this be alike immortalized?—Shall the veil be drawn over the points of interest, and the little minute incidents which fill up the interstices, and give beauty to the picture, shall they be forever unknown? Alas! they are buried in the brick and mortar of the walls that inclosed them, or in the breasts of the interested spectators in the scene, who were so engrossed in the magnitude of the occasion, that little attention could be given to the little incidents.

We shall then have to depend on our imagination. The "president judge" enrobes himself in his ermine, to preside in the trial of charges which he had before affirmed. The jurors take their seats to hear the testimony,



which they have already themselves testified to; and the advocate appears, to present evidence, and make a plea, which had probably already been committed to writing. Are they so insensible to the mockery they are attempting, that they can master their own gravity?—Could they realize the picture they present to the eyes of others, they would veil, to the extent of their ability, each his agency in the business. It would seem, that each should hardly look the other in the face, and avoid the risibility of his features. Each should in his neighbor's see the blushes of his own.

As they have sent out to the world these charges and specifications fraudulently in the name of a Church—which repudiates such action and such members—where the actors are unknown, their presentation may produce an effect, which it will not have where they are now well understood. For the benefit, therefore, of the friends abroad, the several specifications will be noticed in their order.

#### First Charge.

"That Elder J. V. Himes has evinced in his management of the Second Advent publications, and the property and funds derived from the same, a want of economy, open-dealing, candor, and unbending integrity, so essential to a Christian, and more especially to one who has called himself a 'GENERAL AGENT' of the Second Advent Body."

Before noticing the specifications, it may be as well here to say a few words in reference to the relation an agent sustains to those whose agent he is, in distinction from his relation to his own private affairs. This embodiment of the honesty and wisdom of this last age, either in its mystification, or in its wickedness, seems to be entirely ignorant of the possibility of the same persons sustaining the two relations.—Whether they are unable to discern the various matters on which they have attempted to enlarge, or whether they do not choose to, is a point not fully settled. The continuous succession of blunders all over the pamphlet is indicative of a lack of discernment. But the ancients had a proverb:—"Whom God wills to destroy, he first makes mad,"—which may explain the present mental obtuseness which so obviously afflicts the authors of this wonderful specimen of American literature.

It can hardly be necessary to give any information on this point to the great majority of our readers; but the intelligent will bear with us, if we seek to remove the mists which may have been thrown around the minds of any less fortunate.

THE SPECIFICATION under the first charge is as follows:

"Specification. While professing to act as 'GENERAL AGENT' of the Advent Body, and they virtually recognizing him as such, he has loaned funds thus put into his hands, and the profits on the same, to favorites, and has lost many of these sums, and thus the cause has been defrauded of what rightfully belonged to it."

This specification is a LIBEL, and subjects the parties making it,—the printer of the pamphlet, and all whose names are voluntarily connected with it,—to the liability of a trial before a court of justice: the crime in this State is punishable by fine and imprisonment,—the party libeled having nothing more to do with the trial than he would have in the trial of a thief who had broken into his house, and stolen his goods. Not one penny entrusted to him by others has been loaned or lost, or knowingly diverted from the channel intended by its donor. The charge of *fraud* is a high charge, and one from which there could be no escape. Whatever sums of money Mr. Himes may have loaned, have been of his own earnings. Among the favorites to whom they have been loaned, are such favorites as Dr. Pierce and M. Wood, the latter of whom is one of those by whom money has been lost.—Elder H. having given him when he saw he could never collect.

That these men knew that the charge of defrauding the cause, by loaning such sums of money, (which will be noticed again,) was a *libel*, is demonstrated on pp. 71-75, where the authors of this charge attempt to demonstrate that Dow & Jackson were the original proprietors, and that they sold out to Eld. Himes. This will also be noticed in its place; but they say, (p. 64): "The second volume of this paper [was] commenced April 1, 1841, and Mr. Himes was the *legal proprietor*." Here they are trying to make Elder H. like one of themselves—a deceiver. And again, on p. 99: "Now all this time he is *legally* the owner of the 'Herald' and whole book concern."—This loaning and losing *his* earnings, would be no *fraud* on any one but himself, according to their own confession.

Now comes the *evidence* under this head. What is said about loaning money to others, and losing money by such, will not be replied to here—it not being necessary to go into the question whether a man has a right to make such disposition as he chooses of his own. When he has had a surplus on hand, he has been willing to assist, for a limited period, those who, when he was in need of funds to carry on his office, assisted him in a similar manner—as all business men are in the habit of doing; it being a part of the mode of doing business. Not one cent has ever been lost by loans, except

by those to whom Elder H. was under such obligations,—saving sums of \$5 to \$25, when brethren, in need (and there have been many such,) have borrowed for present necessities, and not been able to pay—and the debt has been cancelled, as Mr. Wood's was. This, instead of being a crime, is put by generous, noble-minded souls among his good deeds, being evidences of his generosity, and willingness to assist the needy—of which trait of character some of the unworthy have taken advantage. In a single case only, a man doing work for him got a portion of his pay in advance, and cleared out, leaving the work undone. These being his own funds, were at his own disposal.

There is, however, a single case to be noticed. In the first "batch" of charges which Elder Needham presented, on the authority of Madam Rumor, who came to him one afternoon, bathed in tears. It reads as follows:

"With having fellowship with a liquor-dealer, and endorsing notes for him at the bank, to enable him to prosecute that business, knowing the facts in the case."

This charge is here brought under this specification. To sustain it, M. Wood testifies that Elder H. told him nearly two years since, that he had loaned money to one Nichols, a liquor dealer, in Ann-street, Boston, for two years past, for the purpose, as he (H.) professed, of ultimately getting him (N.) out of that business—having loaned to the amount of \$500 or \$600—wanted him, Wood, to take goods of Nichols, and that N. had gone to California, by which he (H.) would lose several hundred dollars.

How Nichols can have been in Boston for "two years past," and in California for the same time, does not appear; the witness probably meant the two years previous. He has, however, given an untruthful statement. The history of that case is this:—Mr. Nichols resided in Medford, and was an early friend of Mr. Miller, who introduced him to Elder H. Mr. N. afterwards removed to Charlestown, and his house was Mr. Miller's home when in this vicinity. Mr. N. was in good circumstances, and was of great assistance to Elder H., by loaning him money to aid him in publishing the paper and books, in the early history of the cause, when friends were few and were most needed. He was also generous in his donations to the cause. On one occasion he brought in a note of \$160 against a book-binder, which he said he would present to Elder Himes if he would take it in the man's work. The man thus paid it in full. When Elder H. could not get his payment, as per agreement, for money loaned Dr. P., he had to borrow of Mr. Nichols; and so on other occasions.

Now for another picture. Several years since N. went into partnership with a tobaccoist in Ann street. Mr. Wood has repeatedly stated to S. Bliss and others, that Mr. N. was induced to go into that arrangement through representation made by P. Dickinson—and that D. was owing N. a sum of money, and had a similar claim on the tobaccoist; and that by this arrangement D. got his pay of the tobaccoist, and paid N.; Mr. N., however, lost by the arrangement, the establishment not being as solvent as he was made to believe. He lost several thousand dollars by it. While there he became obligated for the payment of some notes given by a neighboring firm in the grocery business, liquor selling, &c. Being obligated for the payment of those notes, he was obliged to go into business with that house. As soon as Elder Himes found that he was selling liquor, he exerted his influence to get him out of it.—He never loaned him a penny while in it, to aid in that business, and did not relinquish his efforts till the store was rid of it, and continued so during N.'s connection with it. Mr. Nichols afterwards sold out the store to another person, whose note he took for the same—himself going into business as a "Commission Merchant," at Nos. 9 and 10 Canal Block, Blackstone street. Such was the heading of his bills, which also contained the following, which we copy from one before us. "S. N. Nichols, dealer in Flour, Grain, Meal, Butter, Cheese, Pork, Lard, Beans, and Dried Apples." He never sold liquor in this store, to our knowledge. After his connection with the other ceased, his successor there put back the liquor. Mr. N. not having got his pay, wished his friends to assist him by getting goods there to be charged to his account—the only relation he sustained being that of creditor. Under these circumstances, Mr. Wood traded there. Afterwards, Nichols had to attach the store, and have its contents sold at auction, by which he received less than one third of what he sold the store for. He sold out his store in Canal Block, in 1848, to "Billman & Golding," who introduced Wines and Liquors. Mr. N. then went into the "Flour and Grain" business in Kneeland street, near the Worcester Depot—having no farther connection with either of the other stores. While in this place, he was introduced to Mr. Weetsee as a flour merchant. While here, he represented to Mr. H. that if he could get \$400, he could do a good transaction in the purchase of some grain, which was for sale on Long Wharf, and asked Mr. H. if he would loan him his note. Elder H. did so;

Nichols endorsed it, but came back saying that he could not get the money on it; and returned it to Mr. H. This note was the one Mr. Dickinson saw, as he testifies on p. 54. On p. 99, Elder N., in his "plea," as evidence that "he has plenty of money on hand," says that he "can send his note into the market, to the amount of FOUR HUNDRED DOLLARS"! A man being able to GIVE his note, manifests great evidence of the abundance of his means!—May not a man, without being worth a cent, give his note to any amount? To get other's notes, might be some such indication! But we forget that we are talking with scientific men. This is the note which in Elder N.'s first charges was said to be endorsed at the bank to aid in the liquor business! That charge respecting this note seems here abandoned.

Elder H. gave N. other accommodations, but not a penny, knowingly, while in the sale of liquor. He had become embarrassed, and Elder H. would have been wanting in regard for the favors he had received of his old friend, and the early friend of Father Miller, when friends were to be prized, if he had refused to assist him.—Mr. N. went to California, and is in a fair way to cancel all his obligations to all men. If what N. now owes Mr. H., belonged to the cause, and it had lost, it would have been the gainer by him, as Mr. H. has been—even if he should lose. Mr. H. never endorsed a note at the bank for him—never assisted him to carry on the liquor business—which he was in but a short time, and much less, "knowing the facts in the case." Mr. Wood cannot plead ignorance of these facts, as they had been explained to him. Yet he comes forward and thus testifies, when he had repeatedly said, "Nobody believes the charges preferred" by Elder N., of which this is one. Instead of helping people into such business, Mr. H. helps them out, and would be happy to help more out.

On p. 54, Mr. Wood testifies, that Mrs. Burgin, one of the oldest and most respected ladies of the Chardon-street Church, told him that she had seen Mr. N. sell spirits, and that Elder Himes knew it. She volunteers the following contradiction:

"I hereby certify, that I gave no such testimony as is imputed to me on p. 54 of Mr. Weetsee's pamphlet. It is a wicked perversion of what I did say, made as I believe, for a most unrighteous purpose. I had no knowledge myself that Mr. N. ever sold liquor, and never told Mr. Wood that, or that Elder Himes had any knowledge of his business."

CHARITY BURGIN.

Boston, Aug. 3d, 1850.

The value of M. Wood's testimony on this point, and others, is learned from the following:

Sugar Hill, Sept. 3d, 1850.  
DEAR BROTHER HIMES:—The "Pamphlet" is received. We all receive a passing notice. I perceive Micajah Wood has figured rather largely in testifying against you. At our first Conference in the spring, I inquired especially and severely of Mr. Wood and Mr. Hamblin, if any thing could be brought against you. Mr. Wood said "No, nothing," and Mr. Hamblin said, "It would all end in smoke." I perceive I was rendered unfit to judge of your course, because I had received special favors at your hands. I have received nothing special, save strict honesty and integrity in your dealings, and much kindness in my sickness. I think this affair may not be lost upon any of us for good. I see nothing to justify their course in relation to the matter.—Yet we must bear the indignity without murmuring. Let us seek for greater humility and more devotedness to the cause of our blessed Lord, who suffered for us, and endured great contradiction of sinners against himself.  
I. H. SHIPMAN.

The second charge in the pamphlet is, "That he has treated various brethren in the ministry, in matters of public notoriety, (not between two private persons as such) in a manner unbecoming a Christian."

The brethren named who have thus been ill-treated, in as many specifications, are J. S. White, J. P. Weetsee, L. P. Judson, and M. Bachelier.

In the case of the first, the following is given as the testimony of "Sister Weetsee." She asked "Bro. Himes, Don't you think Bro. White is a good man?" Himes replied, "No, I had as lief see the devil with his cloven foot come in my office as to see him."

Now, Elder H. has no recollection of saying any thing of the kind. He is not in the habit of making such remarks. Brother Charles Churchill, of Lowell, testified in the office on the 5th inst., that in conversation with Mrs. W., on that day, she had no recollection of having heard, or made that remark.

The opinion which Elder H. has had of Mr. White for the last two or three years is, that he was a man of high moral integrity and great conscientiousness; but that he had got his mind prejudiced—a kind of kink in it,—which made him easily sympathize with whoever opposed the "Herald," and take sides with them against it. He now sympathizes with the pamphlet; and it is not at all strange, that, seeing he would have so much more confidence in Elder H.'s enemies than in him, without having the enormity of their course spread out before him, he should conclude that Elder H. is the villain charged; but when he shall see the full narration of it, it is expected that his love of truth and honorable dealing will produce a reverse in his feelings, and that he will be prompt to disconnect his name from the place it occupies with theirs. Should he not do so,—should he, after seeing their works developed, still fellowship their course, then it will be confessed, that the high-mindedness ascribed to him, was wrongly attributed—the result of not fully knowing him.

2. In the ill treatment of J. P. Weetsee, it is claimed that it consists—1st, in pecuniary dealings; and 2d, in representing him as a wicked man, in having circulated things designed to injure Elder H. To the last, Elder H. pleads guilty. To the former, he says, "Let Elder W. present his bill for any just claims he may have, and he will find no delay in that which is just and honorable." In this connection, a sister testifies, that Elder H. said he had paid Elder W. \$400, and \$3 per day for putting him; and Elder W. says, "He (H.) brought in a bill against the Church of \$27"—i. e., for putting. Well, that was the amount paid for advertising him, and for bills posted during his attempted effort last winter—some of the time at the rate of \$3 per day. Elder H. said he paid \$400 for the support of the Society—as the bill he gave for the various items shows, of which the \$27 for putting was one; but that the entire bill was given to the Society, without requiring of them a cent, as Mr. W., when he wrote the above, well knew.

3. In the case of Judson, it is not known that any injustice has been done him.

The assertion made, is a misunderstanding of what was said. Elder J. had sometimes been an abolitionist, and sometimes a Temperance lecturer, had been sometimes engaged in the sale of patents, and sometimes in other business. At the Home meeting, he wished the brethren to receive him, promising to give his whole attention to lecturing on the Advent. After he had been six months in the field, and tried at the West, he was sent for East, under the supposition, that in connection with judicious men, he would keep at his work and do good. Elder W., not knowing his fiftiness, thought him a fit person to engage in the work of removing Elder H. When W. found that J. had let out the secret to Bro. Osler, he complained to Elder H., that he had no right to send for such a man East. "He was better calculated for the work I set him about, than for that you set him to perform," was the reply. This representation of the case,

is made by them a deception, because, say they, it speaks both well and ill of him.

4. In the case of Mr. Bachelier, the conversation referred to with him, was harmoniously adjusted before the parties separated, as the witness confesses he knew. If he feels aggrieved, it is yet to be learned; or that he sanctions the use made of his name.

"CHARGE 3d. That Elder J. V. Himes has treated certain officers of Chardon Street Church and Society, (heretofore known by that name) and private members and others of like faith, in an improper manner, and highly derogatory to his Christian standing."

The parties specified under this head are T. Marshall, J. P. Weetsee, M. Wood, and P. Dickinson.

1. T. Marshall is represented as testifying that Elder H. visited his father's house in Ireland in 1847; was treated by him with great kindness, that witness came to America in 1849, met Elder H. in Brooklyn, N. Y., was invited by him to his house,—went there and staid one week in October, then was in Salem one week, found Elder H. so cold on his return, that he left his valise in the office, went out and found a boarding house, by the help of a police officer, at \$3 per week; while there, was employed by Elder H. three weeks, for which he was not paid,—that it was not to only half the amount, then got employment in Chelsea, which he left at the request of Eld. H., to whose house and office he returned, making in all at the latter 14 weeks, and 6 at the former, receiving for which not more than \$30, and while boarding there, frequently obliged to provide for his necessary wants—no provision being made for them by the family, and that Elder H. had said that he, M., had cost him \$50.

Thus T. Marshall is represented as testifying—there being no evidence that he authorized any such testimony. He is a young man from Ireland, at whose father's house Elder H. very pleasantly enjoyed his hospitality a single night, but did not see the son—he not being at home. In the fall of 1847, at the Brooklyn tent meeting, young M. introduced himself to Elder H., and told him he was in search of business. Elder H. promptly told him to make his house his home, according to his pleasure. He was there a week, and then went to Salem. On his return, he said that he hoped to get business soon, but did not wish to be an expense to any one, had money to pay for his board, and preferred a boarding house, thanking Elder H. for his kindness and attention. Failing to get business, and his means diminishing, Elder H. told him he might come into the office and make himself as useful as he could, the time he did not wish to devote in search of a place; and that till he could get a place, he would give him a home, supposing he would go to his house. Elder H. went out of town, and on his return, finding that M. had not gone to his house as he expected, gave him \$5 to assist him,—his services not being necessary in the office, and M. expressing his satisfaction. By the kindness of a friend, a place was found for him at Chelsea, where, to accommodate the friend applying, he was offered his board for what he could do in cutting leather for shoes by a pattern. He was there about ten days, when he came to the office and told Elder H. that he was unhappy there, complained of his fare, work, want of society, sympathy, &c. "Make my house your home till you can find business, and in the meantime do what you can to make yourself useful in the office," said Elder H. He came back to his house, received his board and some \$30 in money, in all about \$50. He then wished to make some more definite arrangements, but failing in this, there being no necessity for his services in the office, he was disappointed, and conceived the idea that he was regarded as burdensome, and abruptly left—saying to Elder H. at the time he left, that he was under a great obligation to him for his kindness, and should ever feel that he had been a father to him. If he lacked food while at his house, it is not the experience of others stopping there; and if he purchased meals elsewhere, it was because he chose to absent himself from the regular meals, or neglected to make known his wants, when not in at regular hours.

This young man is evidently an honest and conscientious man, but may be easily worked on and prejudiced by the designing, and is very sensitive to any supposed reflection on himself, or apparent neglect. When he left the office, he went into the employ of M. Wood, and there fell in with J. P. Weetsee and G. Needham, who perverted him to their purposes, and made a tool of him.

Boston, July 30th, 1850.

"This will certify, that within a week after he left the office, T. Marshall came to me, to prevent, as he said, my getting a wrong impression respecting his leaving. He said he was not dissatisfied with Mr. Himes, that he had always been treated by him well, but that he thought Mr. H. spoke to him abruptly, and as if he was a burden to him, and he could not stay where he was burdensome; but he wanted I should understand, that he had nothing against Mr. H."

Some days after this, he stated in the office that Messrs. Needham and Judson had been to him to find out about affairs in the office, but that he soon found that they wished to make a tool of him, and they got nothing.

Still later, he said that he learned he had been called a liar at the office, and that we said he wanted a young man from Ireland to be dismissed, to make way for him. He was told that those who told such tales, told what was not true, and were trying to make a tool of him for their own purposes; that he would find such persons no friends, and should not allow himself to be deceived by them.

Before the council, which took into consideration Needham's charges—the second charge being, "with treating Bro. Marshall in a manner unbecoming a Christian," (p. 28.) M. said that that charge was made without his authority or consent, that he had no complaint of the kind to make, that there was nothing between him and Mr. H. that they could not settle in five minutes, that all there was between them was that he was disappointed, and that the statement of the case made before the council by Mr. H., which was the same as the foregoing, was correct.—This last those present will recollect."

SYLVESTER BLISS.

We hereby certify, that during the time T. Marshall was occupied in the *Herald* office, the duties of the office could have been performed without his assistance, as they had been before, and have been since, by the other persons employed, without his aid.  
SYLVESTER BLISS, MICHAEL FLOOD.

LETTER FROM MR. M. FLOOD.

This will certify, that T. Marshall told me—his words, as near as I can remember, were—that certain persons had been to see him, and in an under-handed and cunning manner, wished him to make some statements regarding certain things—the "certain things" I understood to mean the financial affairs of the office, but he afterwards denied the application—but he, mistaking their design, refused to make them any the wiser. I understand that he told the same afterwards to Mr. Himes. He also told me, that those persons who charged Mr. Himes with treating him in an unchristian manner, did so on their own responsibility,—that it was not done with his consent; on the contrary, he had always regarded Mr. H. as his best friend, in fact, his only friend, and therefore could not honestly make such a charge.  
MICHAEL FLOOD.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to state, that having been employed by Mr. Himes, for nearly five years, as clerk in his office, and having during that period ample means of putting a fair estimate on his character, I can say, that a more honest or honorable man it would be difficult to find. He conducted his business in a strict regard for truth and justice, and a sincerity of purpose highly creditable to himself. His treatment of those in his employment was gentlemanly indeed; never have I known him on any occasion to use a harsh or angry word to any of them. I have every reason to believe he has their entire confidence and esteem.

I regard Mr. Himes as a good man, and an excellent employer.  
MICHAEL FLOOD.

Boston, Sept. 11th, 1850.

Mr. Flood was a clerk in this office till within a few weeks.

2. J. P. Weetsee—see 2d charge.  
3. M. Wood. If he has been treated improperly, it has been in showing favors to him when he was unworthy of them. The charge is, that Elder H. represented him as being at the bottom of this whole business. Well, guilty is the plea to this.  
P. Dickinson. The conversation respecting him has been perverted. The difficulty with him is, that after he held the Tabernacle, and had paid was more due, which would be paid when all its affairs were settled. Afterwards he claimed that he had overpaid, but parties have never been able to get a settlement, or to get an opportunity to examine the accounts of the same. He refuses to settle with the committee to this day. Wood and Hamblin signed letters to him, with Elder H. protesting against this, and pleading for a settlement, to which no answers have been given. Copies of those letters are now in the *Herald* office.

4TH CHARGE. That in his course, as pursued relating to Church organization in general, and especially as exhibited in the Second Advent cause, in Boston from its commencement, he has evinced a want of a consistent, unbending, Christian principle, and a strict moral integrity.—p. 60.

This is also the fourth charge in Needham's first "batch" of charges. This charge is based almost entirely on the testimony of M. Wood, who was offended, because a creed that he assisted in getting up, was discontinued by Mr. H., and at his suggestion set aside; while afterwards H. favored a judicious organization. This is one of the charges, which, when presented in May, Wood said nobody believed. If he did not believe it then, he can have no great faith in it now.

5TH CHARGE. That in secular dealings, J. V. Himes has been wanting in that scrupulous integrity, and deep moral principle, so necessary to every Christian, and especially to a minister, and still more to one looking for the return of Jesus.—p. 62.

1st Specification. That, in his legal relationship to the paper called the 'Signs of the Times,' and afterwards, 'The Advent Herald,' Mr. Himes has shown a want of openness and unbending Christian principle.—p. 63.



This specification is the same as the third specification, under the 6th charge, and will be there noticed.

2. This is called the "case of J. Buffum." This is an old offence, dating in "1835 or 1836," before Mr. H. was an Adventist. It consists of a letter of J. Buffum, who represents that he was induced by Mr. Himes to sign a note of \$800, to secure a title to a farm for a school in Beverly; that Mr. Himes and P. R. Russell endorsed it. That he had his property attached to pay the note, commenced suits against H. and R., received some \$30 or \$40, and released them; that since, they have been able to pay, and have not. This certificate of Buffum they had him swear to before a justice of the peace.

The only bearing that this case has on the history of the "Secret Workings," is its illustration of their determination to crush, and to leave no stone unturned, to accomplish that object.—Else, why did they go back 13 years?

The history of the case will be found in the following letters. It is only necessary here to state, that Elder H. never received a dollar of the money for which the note was given. J. Buffum was the only one who could expect to be pecuniarily benefited by the success of the institution. When the note was given, Mr. Amos Sheldon, who owned the farm on which the institution was, gave Mr. H. the following certificate:

"This is to certify, that I have this day given my name as endorser to a certain note of hand, given this day, and made payable to myself for eight hundred dollars in six months from date. Said note is understood to have been endorsed for the convenience of Col. Amos Sheldon; and J. V. Himes is in no way personally accountable for the same.

[Signed] AMOS SHELTON.  
Boston, Sept. 5, 1837.

The above certificate left Mr. H. legally, but not morally bound for the note. Mr. Sheldon failed, so that the endorser, who had received no benefit from the note, became personally holden for it. Mr. Buffum sued Mr. Himes, and attached his furniture, library, and then settled with him in full, giving the following certificate:

Lynn, Oct. 22, 1841.  
"Received of Joshua V. Himes twenty dollars in full of all demands, and more especially, for a certain judgment and execution which I now hold against him."

[Signed] JONATHAN BUFFUM.  
This cleared Elder Himes legally. This is the case referred to in one of the letters of Bro. Warner, in the following statement:

"He also stated, that a reputable person stated to him (Weethee), that Himes had cheated him out of \$2000. Weethee added that he did not know whether the person's statement was true or not." (See letters.)

Who made the enlargement from \$800 to \$2000? It is a sample of the enlargement of most of the statements in the pamphlet. This was told to prejudice the mind of Bro. and Sister Warner; and with other things produced that effect. In consequence of this, Elder H. made an explanation of the whole case before the Church, in the presence of Weethee, yet W. has gone right on as though no explanation had been made. Elder Needham in his plea, (p. 104) denies of this, that anything "had been said about it, by those who he says were hunting up," &c.—a fair specimen of all his statements.

The following letters will show that Buffum was as much, if not more, interested in the success of the institution than any one:

LETTER FROM ELDER P. R. RUSSELL.

Manchester, (Mass.) Sept. 6th, 1850.  
To REV. D. I. ROBINSON.—Dear Sir:—I received your letter of yesterday is received. You say you have seen my name in a letter from Jonathan Buffum, of Lynn, to Dr. George Pierce, in connection with that of Rev. J. V. Himes, and request me to give you "an account of the origin and history of a Manual Labor School in Beverly, so far as Messrs. Himes, Buffum, Sheldon, and myself were concerned," and you propose six questions for me to answer. I will take up the questions in order.

1. "Was Jonathan Buffum interested in his feelings and efforts to start and sustain this School as much as yourself and Mr. Himes?" Yes, I think so. Mr. Buffum was at that time (1835) a member of my congregation, in Lynn, and professed the deepest interest in the origin and history of a Manual Labor School in Beverly, so far as Messrs. Himes, Buffum, Sheldon, and myself were concerned," and you propose six questions for me to answer. I will take up the questions in order.

2. "Did he (Mr. Buffum) encourage or propose improvements and expenditures which involved the School in debt?" Yes, I think so. I never knew him to object to any plan or project on account of expense.

3. "Had you any subscriptions or promises of help from friends to encourage going on with the school, and were not afterwards paid?" About the end of the first year, if I remember correctly, it was thought best by the trustees to purchase the farm. The dependence for friends was wholly upon subscription. Mr. Himes and myself visited New Bedford, Fair Haven, Fall River, Providence, and other places, and raised a considerable sum of subscription, to be paid by instalments. Sometime during the second year, a convention of the friends of the School was held in New Bedford, and some \$400 was subscribed. Mr. Buffum was present, and witnessed the tokens of interest, and appeared to be much encouraged. Subsequently, Wm. H. Stowell, of New Bedford, promised to pay \$300, and other gentlemen in that city gave encouragement of doing something handsome for the School. But a small amount of the subscription was paid down, and when the "hard times" came on, the School failed, and the subscribers refused to pay their subscriptions.

4. "Had Mr. Buffum connection with the shoe business which gave a prospect of realizing a profit from the success of the School?" The shoe business was introduced into the institution at his suggestion, for the purpose of aiding in the support of the school. The shoes, and for making a certain price what the price was, I do not remember. I have no means of knowing whether he made a profit out of the work of students, or not.

5. "Did the great failures of 1837 through the land affect the school disastrously?" Yes, it was about that time things all began to go wrong. Mr. Sheldon, the owner of the farm, and one of the active trustees, failed. The property, with all the improvements, fell into the hands of his creditors—"money was hard up"—the banks would not discount and stopped specie payment—the shoe business went suddenly down—Mr. B. refused to furnish the students any more work, and the most of the students, for the want of means, left for home, many of them in debt to the institution, which has never been paid. Various suggestions were made to keep the breath of life in the school, but it was all in vain. Neither money nor students could be had, and the school expired.

6. "In the note, or notes, which you and Mr. Himes endorsed, was it expected of you, or did you expect to pay, or were Messrs. Sheldon and Buffum, the signers, and you, the endorser, to make the notes satisfactory, endorser being required as a matter of form?" Mr. Buffum affirms that a note of \$800 was made for the purpose of making the first payment on the farm, and that he and Mr. Sheldon were the promisors, and Himes and I endorsed it. My impression is that my name was not attached to the \$800 note, but to a small one. But be this as it may, I was not one of the trustees at the time, and the institution had no claim upon me further than my own subscription. Messrs. Sheldon and Buffum were known to have nothing. I was requested to lend my name to the parties as a matter of form, and was assured that no responsibility would attach to me. What passed between Mr. Himes and the other parties I do not remember. Before the note came to maturity, Mr. Sheldon failed, the School went down, the subscriptions could not be collected, and Mr. B. was held responsible. Before I was called upon to answer to my name, Mr. Buffum also failed. He then sued me, and attached my library. I went to the Hon. Isaiah Breed, his assignee, told him the circumstances, that I had but about \$40, which I would pay if I could be discharged. He blamed Mr. B.—said he had done wrong—accepted my proposal, the money was paid, and I was discharged. How the matter was finally settled with Mr. Himes, I have no positive, personal knowledge. Yours, P. R. RUSSELL.

\* No purchase was made. The note had no reference to a purchase, but simply of accommodation. See Sheldon's certificate given at the time.

CERTIFICATE OF MR. P. H. ALLEY.

I hereby certify and say, that I was over the shoe shop at the Manual Labor School at Cherry Hill, Mass., in 1835 and 6, and that Mr. Jonathan Buffum employed me, and paid me, and I got the shoes of him to make, and returned them to him, he furnishing the horse and carriage; that he was often there, and appeared to be interested as much as any one in the whole affair, and more active than any other.

PETER H. ALLEY.

CERTIFICATE OF MR. JAMES WHEELER.

To whom it may concern: This is to certify, that in the year 1836, I was employed by Mr. Jonathan Buffum, of Lynn, Mass., to take charge of the shoe-shop connected with the Manual Labor School in Beverly, Mass. (on Cherry Hill, so called), of which he was one of the trustees. I took stock from and returned shoes to Buffum's shoe manufactory in Lynn. Mr. Buffum frequently visited the institution, and appeared to manifest as much interest in the institution as any one connected with it.

JAMES WHEELER.  
Lynn, Sept. 6th, 1850.

CERTIFICATE OF D. I. ROBINSON AND B. P. RAVEL.

Mr. Buffum stated to us, that Sheldon and he were the joint signers of the note, and that Himes and Russell were endorser; that he knew they were not worth anything, and did not then expect them to pay; but four names were required to give the note credit.

2. That he, Mr. Buffum, was also interested in the school, and had it go; that he had two sons there, and that he carried

on the shoe business. 3. That he presumed that Himes hoped and thought the school would prosper. 4. Whether he (H.) had the subscriptions, or assurances of friends to supply money, he does not know anything about; but when Sheldon failed, he had to pay the \$800.\* 5. That he sued Himes, attached his library, and got what he could—say \$20; that afterward, at the solicitation of a friend, Himes paid \$20, and he gave him a receipt in full.

D. I. ROBINSON, BEX. P. RAVEL.  
\* Mr. B. failed about this time. What per cent. he paid, we were not advised.

"3d Specification. That J. V. Himes did loan money to one Nichols, a liquor dealer, to assist him in his wicked business, he knowing the fact."—p. 64.

This was presented under Charge 1, being also the 5th of madame rumor's first batch,—which is based only on Wood's testimony, and is one of those which he affirmed "nobody believed," and which Hamblin said was all smoke—i. e., they had got it up for effect. See Shipman's letter, Osler's testimony, &c.

Having been already noticed, it is only necessary to say, that in the form they have given it here, it is a gross libel. It is false in form, and false in fact; false in the letter, and false in its intent. It is false that he loaned to a liquor dealer,—false that he did so to assist him in his wicked business, and false that he was knowing to the fact. It is also false that Nichols was a liquor dealer, in the common acceptance of the term—that being not his regular business, and he being only incidentally drawn into it by the mutations of trade. Elder H. got him out of it, by good counsel and Christian advice, and without money.

"4th Specification. A fraudulent transaction in regard to a coal bill, brought against the Church by Elder Himes."—p. 64.

This being a charge of fraud, is also a high-handed libel, punishable like theft and robbery at the common law—the perpetrators of libels being, by the laws of the state of Massachusetts, classed with other criminals.

It is claimed that on Fast Day last, Elder H. brought in a bill against the Society for coal, amounting to \$125—there being another bill of \$40,—that it came out that the coal was not ordered by the society, but by Elder Himes, that he had kept all his three office fires from the bin of coal for the society—whereas from \$30 to \$50 would have been sufficient to supply the society with fuel and light for a year!

This may be the blackest falsehood in the book, but is by no means the largest—all being equally huge, and alike exaggerated. It would seem from the pamphlet, that Elder H. had been supplied by the society for coal for his office, instead of his supplying them! This is based entirely on the testimony of J. W. Young, who arose with others in the May Conference and affirmed, that he knew of nothing against the character of J. V. Himes. That "full assembly," (p. 27) will recollect the fact. That is sufficient for him.

Now for the facts. The society, instead of furnishing themselves with coal, had used the coal belonging to the office. It being no more than right that the society should be charged for the coal they burnt, the sum of \$850, and that only, was reckoned in the account of Elder H. with them. He had paid for repairing the stoves for the society \$4 50. This with the coal makes \$13. And these two were included in one entry in the following bill, which is the only bill presented on that occasion. This bill contains all the charges for coal which was then or ever presented; and the entire bill was not presented for payment, but as a gift to the society. Yeta gift of coal, for \$850, added to repairs on stoves, making \$13, is exaggerated to \$125, and made a charge against him of fraud!! Was ever anything more unjust!

CERTIFICATE OF MR. JOHN EMERSON.

I hereby certify, that the following bill of items was presented by Elder J. V. Himes on Fast Day, April 11th, 1850, to the Chardon-st. Society, and is the only bill he then presented. The following is a true copy:

The Advent Society to J. V. Himes	Dr.
Balance of Rent of Chardon-st. Chapel, to April 1, 1850. . . . .	308 04
Fixing Stoves (\$450) and Fuel for 1849 (\$850) . . . . .	13 00
Cash paid Ministers (A. H. and L. P. J.) . . . . .	50 00
For supplying Pulpit (J. D. and J. W. B.) . . . . .	11 00
Bills for Advertising . . . . .	27 25
	\$409 29
Credit by collection . . . . .	3 50
Balance due . . . . .	405 79

[NOTE—Other items, paid for the Society's benefit, and which are not included in the above bill, amount to between \$30 and \$50.]

After Elder Himes presented the above items, some very strange questions were propounded, which are better understood now than they were at that time. Elder Himes had to leave the meeting before it closed, to fulfil an appointment. They were discussed by Bro. Hopkinson and others, and in a subsequent meeting Elder Himes fully explained, and all appeared to be satisfied. But it should be further stated, that after Eld. Himes had presented the bill given above, he stated that he should make a donation to the Society of the \$405 79; and as Elder Weethee was pleased to say, that he should hold Elder H. responsible for his salary also, which then amounted to about \$100, Elder H. thought the Society ought to raise that sum themselves and pay Mr. Weethee; but said that if they did not choose to do so, he would pay that; These are the facts in the case, to which I am prepared to give my oath, if required.

Boston, Sept. 2d, 1850. JOHN EMERSON, Treas. Chardon-st.

This is the last specification under the head of dishonesty in certain dealings. The business men of Boston, who have been the stereotype printers, book-binders, paper makers, &c., with whom Elder H. has done business from the first, wish to give an expression of their opinion in the case.

The following is from the proprietors of the New England Type and Stereotype Foundry, one of the oldest and most extensive establishments of the kind in the country, where all the stereotyping for the office has been performed:

LETTER FROM MESSRS. HOBART AND ROBBINS.

Boston, Sept. 3d, 1850.

REV. J. V. HIMES.—Dear Sir:—A pamphlet, purporting to give an account of a "trial" of yourself, having come under our notice, and in it, finding that one of the preferred charges, by which you were condemned by those who "sat in council" and pronounced judgment against you, is in these words: "Wanting in that scrupulous integrity, and deep moral principle, so necessary to every Christian, and especially to a Minister,"—we feel prompted to offer, and justified in giving you the following testimonial, which we feel qualified to do, through the medium of a long and pleasant acquaintance.

We were connected with the NEW ENGLAND TYPE and STEREOTYPE FOUNDRY, while it was under the management of our predecessor. Your stereotype plates and printing types have been manufactured at this establishment, and you have been the purchaser and the pay-master, to the amount of several thousand dollars; commencing, we believe, with your connection with the publication, in 1840, of the "Views of the late Wm. Miller." In these extended business operations, we have known only you as the proprietor of the papers and publications for which the work has been done; and we are happy to add, that among our numerous customers in the New England States and elsewhere, or even in our social relations, we have found no one more honorable in all transactions with us, none more prompt in payment, or punctual in the fulfillment of all obligations, verbal or written, than you have been.

We, by no means, intend this as flattery, but we feel morally bound to voluntarily say to you, and, if you deem it advisable or necessary, to your other friends and the public, that our predecessor (who is now absent,) and ourselves have, during our entire acquaintance, placed unlimited confidence in, and entertained the utmost respect for you and your actions, and that from the time you commenced business relations at the Foundry, to the present day, your name has stood among the first, having reference to the above particulars—consequently, you may well believe that we were greatly surprised to see such a charge made against you. The effect it produced on our minds, was, that as you have always (we believe) successfully met all charges made upon and against you, that your assailants would not endure the shock, but be themselves the ones to fall to the ground, at the foot of the rock of truth.

On taking up the pen to write our attestation of our belief of your having, at all times, "done by us, as you would that others should do by you," we did not intend to assail your calumniators. But we must say that our surprise, at their course was essentially diminished, when we saw among the names of the (we suppose) self-constituted committee before whom you had your "trial," the name of one, who, a little more than a year since, brought to us some wood and stereotyped cuts, from which, he desired us to "cast" or make others; the price for doing all of which was \$26 62, and for which he agreed to pay us cash, when completed. When done, he came in and desired three months credit—we asked for reference, as he was a stranger to us. He mentioned yourself and Mr. Sylvester Bliss. On applying to you and Mr. B., you both thought him an honest man, and that he would pay as he could procure the means, which you supposed were limited; but, before the plates were delivered, we received positive information that the wood cuts and plates were not his; that they had been surreptitiously obtained. We were strictly forbidden by the real owner in person, and by the owner's attorney, or friend, to deliver them to any one; and the plates are to this day upon our counter, unpaid for. If he is a fair sample of the residue of the committee, you need not fear that your reputation will suffer among honest men, by any overt or other acts of theirs. We are very respectfully yours,

HOBART & ROBBINS.

Having known Mr. Himes for many years, and having been connected with the N. E. Type and Stereotype Foundry for a long period as salesman, I can and do heartily concur in the above.

THOMAS B. FURSEAU.

FROM MOSES A. DOW, Esq.,

Publisher of the "Waverley Magazine," and formerly the business man of the late firm of Dow & Jackson, the printers of the "Herald" for five years or more:

"In regard to Mr. Himes' integrity in business matters, the charges against him are entirely at variance from anything that I have ever discovered in his character. I presume he has paid Dow & Jackson nearly \$25,000; and in all that intercourse of about five years, we never knew him to evade or equivocate in any matter with which we had to do. His word was ever considered by us as a sufficient guarantee for the fulfillment of any promise.

MOSES A. DOW."

FROM MESSRS. GRANT, DANIELS & CO.

This firm have furnished the greater part of the paper used in this office. The senior partner, Deacon Grant, is extensively known as a distinguished friend of the Temperance movement:

REV. J. V. HIMES:—We have no hesitation in saying, that in all your dealings with us, during the last ten years, we have found you prompt in the fulfillment of all your pecuniary obligations to us, and in no respect "wanting in that scrupulous integrity and deep moral principle so necessary to a Christian," as charged in Mr. Weethee's pamphlet. We have had no customer more honorable in all pecuniary transactions with us.

GRANT, DANIELS & CO.,  
9 and 10 Union street.

Boston, Sept. 4, 1850.

FROM W. A. HALL, Esq.

The paper, with a short interval, has been printed at the establishment of Mr. Hall, since Dow & Jackson ceased to be its printers:

This is to certify, that I have been acquainted with Mr. J. V. Himes for many years, and have transacted business with him for the last three years, and that in all my dealings with him, I have found him scrupulously honest, and prompt in all his business transactions. And so far as I know, he has this character from all men of business who have any real knowledge of him, in our city.

WM. A. HALL,  
22 School street.  
Boston, Sept. 9, 1850.

FROM WM. H. HILL, Esq.

The binding of the Advent works were done at the extensive establishment of Mr. Hill, during all the principal sale of the books, and till he retired from that department of business:

Boston, Sept. 11, 1850.

REV. J. V. HIMES.—Dear Sir:—I see that a pamphlet entitled a "Trial of J. V. Himes," has just been issued in this city. On what relates to your character as a business man, I have a word to say. Having had considerable business transactions with you, I have always found you uniformly faithful in the execution of all obligations. And farther, being somewhat acquainted with your financial affairs, and your objects as to trade, I am free to say, that the charges preferred against you of speculation, are regarded as unjust and cruel, by those in this city who are acquainted with you in the transaction of business.

Respectfully yours, WM. H. HILL.

"6TH CHARGE.—That Elder J. V. Himes has been wanting in that scrupulous regard for truth, which should distinguish every Christian."—p. 63.

Under this charge are presented eighteen specifications. "1st Specification.—That he has represented a man as a Christian, whom he had evidence enough to know, was an intemperate man."—1b.

The person referred to is J. S. Josselyn, of Roxbury, of whom there is as yet no evidence that he is not most grossly libelled. If this specification is true of Elder H., it is more true of those making it; for his name was entered in the hand-writing of J. P. Weethee, on the list of members of the church, a year since and on the church records, kept by M. Wood, the principal witness in the case, is the following entry:

"Bro. M. Wood was chosen deacon, in place of Bro. Kelsey, now absent; [had not resigned, and returned in a few months and took his place] and Bro. Paul Mills, in place of Bro. Josselyn, who declined acceptance."—Records, Dec. 11, 1849. After they made this charge, they erased his name from the records without vote, or any action of the church.

He was thus recognized as a brother and a deacon by M. Wood, the clerk, as late as last Dec., when the same M. Wood testified he had known him for several years as intemperate!! This specification was the 7th charge of the former "batch," and which Wood affirmed nobody believed, and Hamblin said were all smoke. No wonder that when Wood says he told Elder H. he was not believed.

Mr. Martha Gray being referred to as a witness in this case, volunteers the following certificate:

Boston, Sept. 9th, 1850.  
This certifies, that what purports to be my testimony in the case of Mr. Josselyn, on p. 65 of the pamphlet, is a gross misrepresentation of what I did say. I never said, and never saw him in any way intoxicated, or in the act of using spirits of any kind. From the fact that he had spirits in the house, and was sometimes peevish; I infer that he was in the habit of daily using it, but do not know by seeing that he did use it. I never heard Mr. Josselyn pray in his family; nor did I ever hear M. Wood. Mr. Wood told me above a year ago, that he had seen Josselyn intoxicated, and in the gutter, and that he had told Bro. Himes, who replied that he did not believe a word of it.

"2d Specification. That he has represented himself as paying and subscribing money for the Chardon-street Church, which he never paid."—p. 66.

This is attended to under the 4th section of the 5th Charge; and under "Mistakes in Mathematics."

"3d Specification. Deception about his real relationship as proprietor to the "Herald," the various Advent publications, and his other property."—p. 67.

I. It is claimed that he has represented himself as "a general agent of the Advent body, and said body as the owners of the publications and property connected with the Second Advent Office in Boston," while "he has been, since Feb. 25th, 1841, the legal owner and publisher." The wonderful intellects engaged in the compilation of the pamphlet, cannot make it clear to their minds how the same person can sustain the two-fold relation of owner and agent at the same time—how he can be the owner of certain property, and at the same time use his own and the donations of others to advance a common cause.

Therefore the references to himself as an agent, and those as owner, are regarded by these wise ones as contradictory. And so, for their great interest in the cause, they must regulate the effects. The development shows that not the cause, but the effects, were what they are the most interested in.

They attempt to show that Dow & Jackson were the original publishers of the "Signs of the Times," and that after they had owned the paper one year, then Elder H. purchased it of them, and has ever since been the legal owner, but has got money of Adventists, by representing himself as the agent of the Advent body.

First, there is no Advent body to be agent of. Even Elder W. admits that "our conferences have not been delegated bodies, but volunteer associations, made up of all Advent believers, male or female, who had leisure and means to come. These conferences have been promiscuous assemblies only."—p. 27. Thus, according to his own confession, there has been no Advent body to be agent of. Any one who wished to act, could. One year, those who had never before been identified, would be found acting; and the next year, others, while the first would have ceased to act. Conferences have been advisory, not legislative or authoritative. They have not been bodies corporate, or permanent organizations, as were the several benevolent societies. There being no body to be agent of, Elder H. can only have been agent for the cause, and of such persons as chose to intrust him to act for them to the extent of the means intrusted. Under such circumstances, intelligent and prominent brethren, capable to advise, conferring together, are of material assistance. They advise, and those giving the means direct, to the amount of their means.

Now for the origin of the "Herald." This paper was originated and first published by Mr. Himes, and to assist Mr. Miller in the circulation of his opinions. Mr. Miller, in his Apology and Defence, states that he became acquainted, Nov. 12, 1839, with Mr. Himes, who invited him to Boston, and made arrangements for a course of lectures. While in Boston, Mr. Himes engaged with Mr. Miller to publish a paper, to be devoted to the advocacy of the Advent cause. Its origin Mr. Miller thus describes:

For a long time previous to this, the papers had been filled with abusive stories respecting my labors, and they had refused to publish anything from me in reply. I had greatly felt the need of some medium of communication to the public. Efforts had been frequently made to commence the publication of a paper which should be devoted to the advocacy of the doctrine, and the communication of information on the fulfillment of prophecy. We had, however, never been able to find a man who was willing to run the risk of his reputation and the pecuniary expense, in such a publication.

On my visit to Boston in the winter of 1840, I mentioned to Bro. Himes my wishes respecting a paper, and the difficulties I had experienced in the establishment of one. He promptly offered to commence a paper which should be devoted to this question,—if I thought the cause of truth would be thereby advanced. The next week, without a subscriber or any promise of assistance, he issued the first No. of the Signs of the Times, on the 30th of March, 1840,—a publication which has been continued to the present time.

With this, commenced an entire new era in the spread of information on the peculiar points of my belief. Mr. Mussey gave up to him the publication of my lectures, and he published them in connection with other works on the prophecies, which, aided by devoted friends, he scattered broadcast everywhere to the extent of his means.

cannot withhold my testimony for the efficiency and integrity of my Bro. Himes. He has stood by me at all times, periled his reputation, and by the position in which he has been placed, has been more instrumental in the spread of these views than any other ten men who have embarked in the cause. His course, both in laboring as a lecturer, and in the manner that he has managed his publications, meets my full approval.—Apology and Defence, p. 81.

Mr. Litch, who has been in the Advent cause from the first days of J. V. Himes: "On the 20th of March, 1840, without money, patrons, or scarcely friends, he issued the first number of the 'Signs of the Times.' The paper was sustained for the first year at a considerable expense to the editor, besides his own unrequited toil. The paper thus started was published for two years as a semi-monthly, and since then as a weekly periodical." (Shield, p. 59.)

Thus commenced by Mr. H., after the issue of the first number, Messrs. Dow & Jackson, not knowing the arrangement for its continuance which had been made between Mr. Miller and Mr. Himes, voluntarily offered to publish the paper for what might be received from subscribers in support of it, if Mr. Himes would furnish the copy. He consented to give the right to publish on those conditions; and they gave notice in the second number that it would be issued by them for one year.—Mr. Himes performing the editorial labor—paying editorial help in his absence—traveling in the neighborhood, and getting subscribers, and establishing agents, &c., at his own expense.

There was only a verbal understanding, in matters of business, between him and Dow & Jackson, and he supposed that at the end of the year it would revert to him. They however had a different impression, and thought they ought to receive a consideration. Mr. H. protested against this as not in accordance with his understanding of it; but to avoid any cause of complaint, paid it, and received in return all the right which he, as original publisher, had transferred to them. Since the last transfer the writers in the pamphlet admit that Mr. H. has been the sole and legal owner. As they admit this, it is hoped that there will be no more misrepresentations on that point.

To show that Mr. Himes was not the original publisher, they go to Mr. Dow, and get a letter which shows the facts in accordance with the fore-going statement. This letter, like everything else they meddle with, they misconstrue, and wrest the meaning of Mr. Dow. He, in defence, indignantly repudiates their misconstruction, and presents the following rebuke:

LETTER FROM M. A. DOW, Esq.

TO THE REV. MR. HIMES:—In a pamphlet published by Mr. Weethee, a letter over my signature, gives what I understood to be the facts in the case. I perceive, however, that the inferences he has drawn from it and his perversion of the object for which I gave it, have a tendency to do you injustice.

To you alone is due the credit of first publishing the paper called the "Signs of the Times," which my note to Weethee allows. In the year 1840, about the commencement of Mr. Miller's course of lectures in the Marlboro Chapel, you called at our office to get printed a sheet in a quarto form, which you called "The Signs of the Times." When you came in to settle with us for the printing, we did not know of the arrangement which you had made with Mr. Miller to publish a paper regularly (which I have just learned from a work by Mr. Miller, entitled, "Apology and Defence," and before you said anything about printing another number, we proposed to take the responsibility of publishing once in two weeks, to which you consented. We accordingly reprinted the first number with the following notice:

"In accordance with the wish of the numerous friends of Mr. Miller and the cause he advocates, we have concluded to issue the 'Signs of the Times' semi-monthly for one year," &c.

You edited the paper, furnished the copy for it without any expense to us, and at an expense to yourself, besides your time and services. You got us the subscribers—beginning with a Mr. Shackford, who advanced a silver dollar for it at the Chardon street Chapel. You, in connection with Mr. Miller, created the demand for it, and you were in all respects its originator. Without you we could have done nothing, and should have had no connection with it—having no faith ourselves in its doctrines. Our connection was only a business one. We were to print it for the income which might be received from it.

At the end of the year you proposed to publish it yourself, and for the future to pay us for the work done. There had been no writing or conversation respecting the ownership of the paper, and we supposed that it was legally ours, although you first commenced it. My partner thought we ought to have \$100 for our interest in it. You protested against the payment of that sum, and had I been alone, I should not have insisted on it, as I believed the printing that would come to us was a sufficient consideration. But you consented to its payment for the sake of avoiding any misunderstanding. I did not then think, nor do now, that you wished such a transfer on account of any pecuniary benefit to yourself, for had that been your object, instead of \$5000, you might have been worth \$100,000, but to enable you to carry on more effectually the advancement of the cause of which it was the organ, and not to be cramped in your efforts by which those who had no faith in it. We then transferred to you our right of publishing, which we had originally received from you; and afterwards knew you only as the proprietor and publisher.

TO BELIEVERS IN THE SECOND ADVENT.

Not being a



I believe he is striving to build up the blessing cause, and is devoting his entire energies to the furtherance of the saints, in peace, holiness, and love. We regret that any evil-minded persons, in different parts of the country, should seek to prejudice the minds of brethren against him, to destroy his usefulness, by their dark insinuations and slanderous reports. We have seen and heard Bro. H. for ourselves. We have the proof of his integrity in the Advent cause, and when his accusers shall show equal faithfulness and purity in the cause, they may have claims to the same confidence and respect." The above writing is not such a letter as Elder H.



denied, it not being expressive "of his course in conducting the *Herald*." He still denies writing letters like those specified. The letters denied were such as would subject him to blame, and the story was told for that purpose: this would subject him to no blame, according to the judgment of his enemies. The council, after a patient hearing of these and three more specifications under the same charge, decided respecting each that they were *sustained*. Mr. Needham, who was present on that trial, heard the evidence, and knew the enormity of the case, and, who could write on the 23d of June, 1850, "There are some four or five here, who would be glad to have Cook, Turner, *et id omne genus* . . . . Turner is impudent as S—Go it, cripples! What a consummate—Marsh is! I think Bro Jones' discussion with Campbell is very unprofitable—I fear C. was never converted," &c.—can now yoke up with former slanderers to injure Elder H. We proceed with the specifications in the pamphlet:

"Specification 9.—Representing himself as the donor of tracts and papers distributed at camp and tent meetings, while charging the same to the 'Tract funds.'"

Mr. N. testifies that he was under that "impression, until after the tour West in the spring of 1849." and Mr. W. adds, "that till recently he had supposed the same." Indeed, and yet when they wish to prove that he has never given anything, they assert that he has always represented the reverse. It is truly marvellous! Elder H. has so represented his affairs that they were *always* under the impression that he was *their* agent; and yet has so represented, that they did, not suspect till recently that it was not all his own! They have evidently a duality of perceptive organs.

13th Specification.—"That Elder J. V. Himes has published deceptive accounts of the Second Advent office."—p. 89. That when calling for help he had loaned Dr. P. \$400, and was somehow connected with Nichols to the amount of \$600. For this connection with N., see "Mistakes in Mathematics."

The facts are these: Soon after the sale of the tabernacle, and Elder H. had received notes of Prescott Dickinson, the treasurer, for a portion of the funds invested in it, George Pierce of Lowell applied to him for a loan of \$400. Elder H. told him he had no money to loan, nor more than was needed in his business. Dr. P. plead his necessities, and offered \$25 bonus. This Mr. H. refused. Dr. P. said, "Then I will give it to your family, as I should have to pay it to others. Finally Mr. H. put himself to considerable inconvenience to raise the money, having to pay, to raise it, nearly the amount of bonus offered, and took P.'s note dated March 20, 1846,—supposing that when the notes of Mr. D. were paid, he should be able for a time to accommodate Dr. P. In 1848, when the wants of the cause in Boston made it advisable to purchase the Chapel, it was necessary to call in this money of Dr. P., it being relied on to make a payment with. "Not receiving it, he had to borrow money for that purpose of Mr. Nichols and others. After the loan above referred to, Dr. P. wished Mr. H. to go with him into a land speculation in Lowell, Mr. H. refused. Dr. P. complained to Bro. Bliss that Mr. H. was not dealing justly by his family in spending all for the cause. Last winter he importuned Mr. H. to become connected with him in the patent Medicine business. Mr. H. told him he would do what he could for him, and advertised his medicines six months, (see last vol.) without charging anything. He made Mr. H. great offers to go in with him, but Mr. H. told him that he could not divert his labors or funds from the use of the cause—that if he should go into any other business he should lose his soul.

These facts would not have been here mentioned, were it not for the great interest Dr. P. now manifests for the cause!

The 14th, 15th, and 17th specifications came up under the 2d charge, and are there noticed. The 16th is under the 5th charge. The 18th, with regard to Professor W.'s professorship, is noticed in "Mistakes in Mathematics."

This brings us to the

#### Seventh Charge.

"That he has treated the Church of which he is a private member, in a manner unbecoming a man in the possession of that humility required in the Gospel."

This is presented under seven specifications, to sustain which no evidence is presented,—it being affirmed that those who sat as judges are sufficient witness! Elder N. follows in a summing up of the evidence, the points of which come under the several heads already noticed. The august court then bring in a verdict of guilty, and pass a formal vote—a withdrawing the hand of fellowship from the subject of their accusations, and order the publication of the trial! Thus ended the ceremony of the *Mock Trial*!

Many of the falsehoods which had been industriously circulated before the development of their conspiracy, are not brought forward in the pamphlet. For a sample of these, see Needham's letter to Bro. Mansfield. Another is referred to in the letter of Bro. Warner respecting the colored family. This was started in the fall of 1844, respecting a member of Bro. Himes' congregation. The falsehood was, that "the wife of an aged colored man had given two thousand dollars to the cause, and left her family poor."—*Boston Post*, Oct. 20, 1844.

It being known that Bro. Riley was referred to, he was appealed to, and he and his wife gave an explicit denial that either had given Mr. Himes anything.

Notwithstanding this denial of both husband and wife—notwithstanding its truth could have been learned by a fifteen minutes' walk, or a five minutes' conversation, it is still reported at New York, that it was received by Bro. Himes from a colored family,—that he "obtained the money from the wife of the colored man," and it is represented as having been "white-washed" over. In the pamphlet (p. 31,) Mr. Weetsee attempts to explain this, by the fact that he lived "at the West," and did not know "the name of the family." But he had the paper at the West; and if he did not know as much as those at the East about it, he should have learned, before he attempted to teach them respecting it. But W. now says, Mr. Himes was only blamed for his published account of it," which he says, "leaves the reader to infer that the whole matter was a perfect fiction; yet

the wife did get the money as stated above, not knowing in what way much of it was expended." Mr. H. was blamed for the fact itself.—See Bro. Warner's testimony. About anything else he could know nothing, only as the family stated it, which statement he published. The husband is dead. Bro. Pearson called on the wife, who indignantly denied the accusation.

Another story circulated was, that L. P. Judson had been wronged out of eight dollars, because Elder H. paid him \$10 for travelling expenses, \$12 for two Sundays at the Chapel, when he charged the Society \$20 for the two Sundays, and \$2 to the Mission fund. On page 130, W. turns it, and makes the Society the one that was wronged, because J. expected to return the \$10. No expectation was had that he would return it, he did not before, and this was not charged him. As the whole account, of over \$400, was given the Society, no great wrong could be done it.

It would be impossible to follow them in all the crooked sinuosity of their course. Hatred, malice, and everything which is unlovely, seems to have been yoked together to enable them to accomplish their selfish ends. They took the first step without considering the consequences, and now unwilling to confess their wrong and retrace their steps, they madly rush on in their ill starred course, regardless of all consequences, except to screen themselves.—They did not look for such a result. Many a one before, having sown "dragon's teeth," and seen them spring up an harvest of "armed men," has had occasion to exclaim:

"The thorns I reap, are from the briars I planted,  
They tare me and I bleed;  
I should have known what fruit would spring from such a seed."

Some other points in the pamphlet will be noticed under other heads. To do justice to its misrepresentations, would require another sheet. It is said that a lie will travel "a mile while truth is putting on her boots;" but when her boots are on, swift must be the lie that does not sooner or later find itself nailed to the counter.

#### Mistakes in Mathematics.

When a person protrudes his pretensions before the community, he must expect that they will be canvassed. That, which it would be ungentlemanly to notice where the party himself gives to it no prominence, when this presented, becomes public property; and he can make no complaint, if his pretensions are scrutinized, and if found not to be well sustained, are exposed.

On p. 93, under the head of Faculty, we read:

"REV. J. P. WEETSEE,  
President and Professor of Mathematics."  
Also—

"REV. J. P. WEETSEE,  
President and Professor of Languages, Ancient History,  
Ancient Geography and Antiquities."

The excuse given for parading this, is the claim that Elder Himes had stated that he never was a Professor. Elder H. had no means of knowing that he ever was a Professor; and his remark was that he did not know that he was such—aside of course from his office of President; for in all the small colleges the President sometimes has to be a Professor, and sometimes a tutor. In Harvard University, the oldest in the country, the President was the only teacher of any kind in it for many years. It is no addition to the dignity of the officer of President of a college, to have that of Professor filled by the same person. On the other hand it takes from his dignity, because it is evidence that the college is not one of the highest rank. There are thirteen colleges in the state of Pennsylvania. There are more than that number of academies in New England, which would not lose by a comparison with many of those colleges in the thoroughness of the course, or the qualification of the teachers. The question in the mind of Mr. Himes was, was he a Professor before he was President, and then elevated to the latter office? From his own statement it seems he was not. Why then should he leave the title of President, and take a more humble title, that of Professor, and that too at this juncture, was a mystery.—There is another thing about the display of the list of Faculty in the smaller colleges which some do not understand. It is customary to have Professors of various sciences which are not taught in those institutions, and the Professors of which perform no duties there, and receive no pay. Thus Professor Bush, one of the best classical scholars in the country, is Professor of Hebrew and Oriental literature in the New York city University. But there are no students, or were not a short time since, and had not been for years, pursuing those studies. And Professor Bush performed no collegiate duties there, and received no remuneration. If we recollect rightly they have a Professor of Music there, if not a Professor similarly situated. Gov. Ellsworth, of Hartford, is Professor of Law in "Trinity college," but there are no law studies taught there, and this too in a college which has its *row* of buildings, not confined to a single brick edifice. This being the custom in the smaller colleges, the list of professorships paraded in the catalogue, is not a sufficient indication of the rank of the college. "Knowing the man," when we saw that parade, "we put down the probe to see what was at the bottom, and he must thank himself for what comes up."

That list of the "faculty" purports [p. 94] to be "an extract from the Catalogue of Students and Officers of Madison College, for 1839 and 1841." Why a Catalogue for 1839 and 1841? Did a single catalogue suffice for those two years?—and was none needed for the intervening year 1840?—or for the previous years?—That institution is only a Latin school now, and has no faculty. Still it may have been on a very respectable footing; but evidence of it does not appear in the pamphlet.

Now for the Mathematics: On p. 54 he says, he, Nichols, "was engaged in the traffic from somewhere in 1845 to the latter part of 1848—in all nearly four years! Is this so? Talking with a Professor of Mathematics will require the technical signs.

$$x = 1848 - 1846 = \text{some months.}$$

$$\text{Thus } x = 2 \text{ years} + \text{some months.}$$

It might as well be said nearly five years as nearly four.

On p. 91 it reads: "He (Pierce) had the use of four hundred dollars, which he borrowed of Elder J. V. Himes, on March 20th, 1846, and for which he gave his note, with interest, besides twenty-five dollars, bonus; that in about fifteen months after the note was given, Elder Himes came to him and wished him to give him a note on Stephen Nichols, in exchange for the former note, signifying that it would be to his (Himes') advantage, and that Nichols should not push him—that the payments were made to Elder Himes, but put on this note; that one hundred dollars were paid by him in the latter part of 1848, and the remainder in 1849—that the whole amount he paid for interest and bonus, was one hundred dollars, making five hundred dollars." From other testimony it will appear that at that time he had about six hundred dollars, some way connected with Stephen Nichols, the liquor dealer, making in all about one thousand dollars. See testimony, p. 53. And also, it will be seen from the Herald of August 18th, 1849, that the Chardon Street Chapel was purchased in that period, (in 1848).

Let us analyze this: He Pierce, had borrowed of Elder J. V. Himes \$400. "In about fifteen months after the note was given," i. e. to Elder Himes, "Elder Himes came to him and wished him to give a note on Stephen Nichols" in exchange for the former note." We shall here get an understanding of their knowledge of business transactions and of mercantile phraseology, which we believe the "Professor of Languages" is not obliged to be familiar with.

Substituting the supposed antecedents from the several hints, it would read: Eld. Himes wanted Dr. P. to give him a note on S. N. How could Dr. P. give a note on Stephen Nichols, when he was at the time unable to pay his own note to Elder Himes? But then Elder Himes promised Dr. P. that Nichols should not push Dr. P. if Dr. P. would give him, Elder Himes, a note on Nichols! How could Nichols push Dr. Pierce for Elder Himes, holding a note which he Nichols would have to pay? It would be a new feature in mercantile obligations for the debtor to push the creditor. We are now beginning to see the want of acquaintance which these men have with the language of business transactions—men who assume to give an opinion in matters of which they have yet to learn the simple language! Was there no Professor of Accounts in Madison College? But Dr. Pierce had no note on Nichols which he could give. The proposition, instead of being that Dr. P. should give Elder H. a note on Nichols, was a request to Dr. P. to give a note payable to Nichols, instead of the one payable to, and held by Elder Himes. This would benefit Elder H. as it would enable him to get his pay of Dr. P. and pay Nichols. With this arrangement Nichols was not to push him, as he might if disposed.

But say these financiers: "From other testimony it will appear that at that time he had about six hundred dollars some way connected with Stephen Nichols, making in all about one thousand dollars!" Yes, it was in "some way connected" with Stephen Nichols. Being unable to get the money due from Dr. P., he had been obliged himself to borrow from Mr. N. So that—according to these mathematicians, who are so fond of having every thing so candid and open in all business transactions,—the \$400 due from Dr. P. to Elder H., and \$600 due from Elder H. to Stephen Nichols, made in all about \$1000. We will see:

$$x = 400 - 600 = \text{two hundred dollars out of pocket} - 1200 \text{ less than the } \$1000 \text{ in pocket, as these mathematicians make it! According to this logic, a man has only to borrow } \$30,000 \text{ and lend } \$20,000 \text{ of it, to make himself worth } \$50,000.$$

But they say the Chardon St. Chapel was purchased in that period (in 1848). Very true, purchased on credit, this money owing by Dr. P. being depended on to make one of the payments with—and money having to be borrowed for that purpose!! Had Dr. P. paid his notes, Elder H. would not have been so much embarrassed.

There is another mathematical curiosity. We give it in full.—On p. 106 we find:

"Some facts are necessary, to know whether Eld. Himes subscribed \$200 or not. According to the Advent Herald, August 18th, 1849, he paid for Chardon St. Chapel, 'with all its fixtures, \$3000.' The interest on the purchase money would be \$180 per annum. Add \$450, ground rent, and you have \$630. Eld. Himes laid out some \$1200 more, that he might have his office in the upper part. It should be stated, also, that the ground can be purchased at any time, up to the end of the lease, (some six years) for the appraisal price: and that it has already risen 2-7 above the appraisal value. Now when the brethren give him \$400 a year, and pay their sexton \$100, light and coal bills, (say the latter at \$50,) I ask if it is not all it is worth? They hire their present (Cochituate Hall) including vestry, ante-room, sexton, fuel and gas lights, for \$550, which would be the same as above.—Four hundred dollars is 13 1-3 per cent. on the purchase price.—Divide the insurance and taxes between the lessor and lessees, and they give him \$375, which is 12 1-2 per cent. clear. We leave it to others to judge whether Eld. Himes gave a fair and truthful statement, when he has, on different occasions, represented that Church as so burdensome, and as himself subscribing two hundred, and giving four hundred, and sometimes the whole."

Such a blunder in an examination for admission to any New England college, would disqualify the applicant. Let us see: On the \$3000 paid for the Chapel, and \$1200 said to be paid for repairs—making \$4200, the interest would be at 6 per cent. \$252 per year. To this add \$450 paid each year for ground rent, and \$98 paid for taxes, insurance, and necessary yearly repairs, it makes the yearly expenses \$800 for the whole building. Elder Himes paid for his former rooms, in Devonshire street, \$150 per year. Deduct this for the portion excepted for his office, and it leaves \$650, the actual cost to him. When then he asks them but \$400 per year, it is not giving \$200 is it? O ye mathematicians! But then the ground has risen 2-7! What has that to do with it! It has not risen since Elder Himes bought the building; and he paid all that the previous rise was valued by those who sold! But no evidence exists that it has risen; it has not been offered or bid on. If it has risen it is of no avail without he has the means of purchase before the lease is out. But suppose he should buy it; does that affect the sum he pays for the Society? If he is willing to run that risk, any rise or fall on it is no concern of others. Its rise would not make him be giving any more less than the rise in value of a man's farm, would prove that he paid no taxes! But, says our accountant: "When the Brethren give him \$400 a year, and pay their sexton \$100, light and coal bills, (say the latter at \$50,) I ask if it is not all it is worth?" What has the amount they pay the sexton, and for coal, to do with the rent? Do you have your fuel and the amount you pay for help in the kitchen deducted from your house rent? Such is your logic! But they pay but \$550 for Cochituate Hall, heated, lighted, and with a sexton! Well, if you think a hall up stairs, hired by the Sunday, and for Sundays only, is worth more than the Chapel, you are welcome to your taste. To be hired for the whole time, as the Chapel was, they asked Elder Himes \$1200, when he was looking for a place for worship, before he bought the Chapel. But the question is not as to the *worth*; it is as to the *cost*; and that is demonstrated. But then, they do not pay for their coal bills as these figures suppose they do, and they burn from the office coal, that is so much additional. But this mathematician says: "The ground rent alone is \$450,—50 more than the supposed rent—leaving no percentage on the purchase price!—a profitable investment! But he says, 'divide the insurance and taxes between the lessor and lessee, and they give him \$375, which is 12 1-3 per cent. clear.' Yes, just as clear as are the ideas of the one making the calculation! But those are not thus divided, the lessor pays the *whole* of those; and then instead of getting his \$375, he presents them with a bill for rent and money paid to sundries, to the amount of over \$400. And these men, seeing that Abbott Lawrence pays his own clerk hire, and Harvard College furnishes its own fuel, cannot *cypher* out how it is that Mr. Himes pays anything! Are they not well qualified, in their own estimation, for the work in which they have been engaged?

#### Errors in Grammar.

On p. 117 is quoted from a note sent Elder Himes by the officers of the church and society the following: "As our late pastor, with a portion of our church and society, have abruptly left us," &c. On the p. following it is thus commented on: "Have abruptly left us! our pastor have abruptly left! what grammar!—what a logical conclusion from the premise! Because the society, the day before, decided to leave, therefore our late pastor have abruptly left us."

The logic is, that the late pastor, having declared he should never preach there again, and his friends having decided to vacate the house at the end of the quarter, which ended that night, and the same persons constituting the portion of the church, and society that had left, it was proper to say of them the day following "they have abruptly left." It is, however, with the grammar that we have to do. It will be recollected that this criticism is made by a late President and Professor in a college, on the letter of the officers of the Church, and who make no pretensions to scholarship. When we set up his article, which was published in the Mail, we corrected several instances of bad grammar and wrong spelling, supposing they were an oversight, and feeling that it would be very small business to mention them. And without this criticism we should have made no allusion to the grammar of this pamphlet. Now, it may be well to notice some specimens. But first we notice the criticism above. The letter asserts that the pastor with [and] a portion of the Church and society have left. All can see that *with* fills the office of *and* in that connection. The latter would be correct. The former, filling precisely the same office, is beneath the dignity of a professor to notice. Now for his grammar. On p. 21 he says: "If all our confidential conversation is to be carried to one person, we had as well have the inquisition at once." In what tense is *had have*?

On p. 91 he says of Dr. P., "Elder Himes came to him, and wished him to give him a notice, &c. Who are the several Himes?"

On p. 11 he says, "I refused to suffer the Hester-street Church to lift a collection for me." Also p. 2, "allowed no collection to be lifted." On p. 6 we find "had sunk" applied to the expenditure of money. On same p. "bound to the Church" for an engagement with it. See "Shift my quarters," p. 12. Provincialisms, that are excusable in common people, are not expected in a professor of languages. On p. 2 he says: "By close application I was licensed to preach in the fall of 1835." Close application to what?—to get a license? so the phraseology says. We suppose he means that by close application to study, he was so well qualified that he was licensed, &c.

On p. 9, he "visited and held meetings in the various parts of the congregation"—meaning parts of the city where the congregation resided. On p. 13 he says, "My services in the office had been worth something. Elder Himes' agent from [in] New Bedford sent on for twenty additional copies, while my numbers should continue. During my stay at New York, it increased I believe between thirty and forty." What increased?—the additional copies? are they the antecedent of it, or does it refer to "numbers" or "services," or his stay in New York. He adds:

"So from other quarters, knowing how close had been my labors" to sustain the cause, &c. In what sense are a man's labors close? What connection is there between this and the preceding.

On p. 19 he says: "The Committee was to meet and attend to their duties." If a verb in the singular number can agree with "committee," the pronoun following should also be in the singular. The pronoun must agree with its antecedent, as well as the verb with its nominative, in person and number.

This might be extended *ad infinitum*, but we forbear.

#### Plagiarism.

On p. 5 he refers to 22 articles on the Fourth Monarchy. The first of this series of articles (See Herald, Dec. 11, 47), contained rules for the interpretation of Symbols. When Elder W. was in New England on his first visit, in the fall of 1848, Mr. Knight, the publisher of "Lord's Literary and Theological Journal," in New York, intimated, in a letter to the office, that those rules were a plagiarism from Mr. Lord's Exposition of the Apocalypse. I conversed with Elder W. respecting it, and he said he had never read that book. I immediately wrote to Mr. Knight, denying that his suspicions were correct. I based my denial on the word of Mr. Weetsee, and his "former high standing," which he spread out before us—writing Mr. K. that he was formerly President, &c. &c., a Minister of the Presbyterian Church, &c.—not then knowing the distinction between that Church and

the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. From the letter I received in reply, I make the following extract:

New York, Oct. 3, 1848.

"Mr. Sylvester Bliss,  
Dear Sir—We were led to believe that Mr. Weetsee had plagiarized the laws of symbolism from the Expositions of the Apocalypse. That it is a plagiarism, it seems to me, no one can doubt. If you turn to the Exposition, pp. 23 to 36, you will see that he copied the words and phrases with little variation; the number of laws are the same, and there is but a slight difference except in the arrangement and omission of a part of the terms in which they are expressed. So manifest was the plagiarism that two gentlemen gave Mr. Lord notice of it, and purposed at the time to write to you and remonstrate with you, or warn you against a correspondent who took such liberties. That he drew the laws from the Exposition, was obvious also from the articles that followed, which exhibited the most abundant proofs that he did not understand their meaning: he advanced a number of views that were wholly inconsistent with them, and betrayed a palpable misconception of the subject.

Very respectfully, yours &c.

FRANKLIN KNIGHT."

On turning to those pages of the Apocalypse, the origin of those rules was obvious. I read the letter to Mr. Weetsee and asked him, "Had you never seen the Exposition of Mr. Lord?" He said he saw it in a book store in Cincinnati, but did not devote much attention to it. "Did you notice those Laws of Interpretation in it?" He said he might have seen them; but added that they were "*ecclesiastical*," and cannot always tell where we get our ideas. As we read, that which makes a favorable impression on the mind is retained; and as we receive from different sources, we express ourselves on corresponding subjects, we present them in words of our own. The agreement in the No. of Laws and the phraseology, with a marked awkwardness of his in explaining it, gave me some uneasiness; but an "act of this kind, being so contrary to the tenor of his past life"—as he narrated his autobiography—I thought, "should be sustained by the clearest testimony." I received his explanation, and attributed his hesitation to what I then considered to be a natural modest reserve on his part. I banished the subject from my mind, and my brethren were none the wiser for it.

It hardly occurred to me again, until I read the proof for the Herald of April 6, 1850, where he presents a synopsis of Laws under a different arrangement, and says: "Some of them are original, others are drawn from the familiar expositions of Mr. Miller, and from a work by Dunbar, as also from the writings of Mr. D. N. Lord, of New York." And again: "Much credit is due Mr. Lord, for the ability and research he has displayed in his writings on the Scripture figures and symbols." I called Bro. Himes' attention to it, and asked if he recollected the conversation I had, as above referred to, in his and Mrs. Himes' presence? He did; but in the overabundance of his charity which hopeth all things and thinketh no evil in any, simply replied: "We are all human."

It is a singular coincidence, that the first article he wrote for the Herald, contained those Laws, and also the last. The committee of three—"transmute," Elder N. calls that number in the pamphlet—had been appointed, and he ceased to furnish any more copy. When asked the reason, he said his health would not permit.

The above is a true statement according to the best of my recollection, which seldom fails me. SYLVESTER BLISS.  
Boston, Sept. 9, 1850.

#### Comparison with Prof. Webster.

Prof. Webster compares it to "the case of a noted criminal," Prof. Webster, "coming into Court with all the demeanor of a lord—interposing his speeches on every occasion, using the most insulting language towards the *president*, judge and the Court," and presenting a paper to the following import; p. 39:

"PRESIDING JUDGE,—

"I have taken my case out of Court, and put it in the hands of some special friends of my own choice, who will see that justice is done me. They are now in session on the case at my house; if you, judge, have any thing to present, you will appear before that body. [Signed] WEBSTER."

Do men of sense see any wit or argument in the comparison? If we were in the habit of drawing such comparisons, we could without drawing materially on the imagination, picture a more imposing resemblance between Prof. Webster and another Prof. W.

Let us attempt a fancy sketch: Prof. Webster had a benefactor, a true friend of his; so had another Prof. W. Prof. Webster obtained the situation he filled through the instrumentality of his benefactor;—so did the other. Prof. Webster demanded other favors of his benefactor;—so did the other. Prof. Webster, not succeeding as he could wish, began to entertain evil thoughts against his benefactor;—so did the other. Prof. Webster laid a plan, which was to be kept a profound secret from his benefactor, until the moment arrived when he should hold an appointed conference with him at a given place;—so did the other. The design of Prof. Webster was to become possessed of certain papers in the possession of his benefactor;—the other wished to change the control of newspapers and other property. Prof. Webster, in the opinion of all the Sabbath School children in the city, was trying to kill his benefactor;—"Even the Sabbath School children," says the other—after hearing only a portion of the enormity of the other case—"to go to their homes and say he is trying [figuratively] to kill" his brother.—p. 26. Prof. Webster did kill his benefactor;—so did not the other. Here the parallel ceases. We shall therefore have to conclude that Prof. Webster was not the guilty criminal supposed—that he only tried to kill, but could not—no fault of his that he did not. Well, Dr. Parkman lives. The blow stunned, it did not destroy him. He is overwhelmed at the scene he had passed through. His brain grows giddy. He exclaims—"Somebody has been attempting some secret workings on me." Prof. Webster emerges from his hiding place, perfectly astonished that his plan has not succeeded—unable to account for his failure. His first thought is, "I have been betrayed." Some stupid fellow has got hold of my scheme and run to my benefactor with it, he was on his guard and warned off the blow. What shall I do? Will not my poor pate have to suffer?" Such might have been his first impression. But he plucks up courage and says, "I am the one referred to in the papers, who had the interview with Dr. Parkman on Friday; the somebody referred to means me;—so said the other when the agency of some nameless person was announced in 'Secret workings.'" Prof. Webster was suspected;—so was the other. Prof. Webster declared his innocence of any attempt on the person of his benefactor;—the other solemnly affirmed that "he had not thought to hurt a hair of his head." Prof. Webster pleaded the improbability of his connection with any such deed of darkness, on the ground of his previous good character;—the other said, "Any act of this kind, being so contrary to the whole tenor of our past lives, should not be credited, unless sustained by the clearest testimony."—p. 1. Prof. Webster sent to the city where he had resided, and obtained the testimony of his neighbors, that they never knew him to commit a crime like that of which he was charged;—so did the other.—pp. 3. Prof. Webster was brought to trial for his offence;—not so the other. He, more fruitful in expedients, himself assumes the ermine, summons a jury of fellow conspirators, and holds a mock tribunal, calling it the "Supreme Court which God has established."—p. 39—hoping thus to turn off attention from himself, and consummate his intended purpose. Prof. Webster feared justice;—the other has not told us his fears. Prof. Webster finally confessed after he was found out, that he did have something to do with it, but denied that it was premeditated;—so does the other. Prof. Webster attempted to palliate the enormity of his offence, by pleading that his benefactor had grossly insulted him;—more gross insults than the other had received, he could not conceive of or believe men of any sense could. Prof. Webster did not acquit himself in that way;—nor did the other. Prof. Webster was regarded as guilty by all impartial readers;—the other is hearing the verdict in his case.

Would a fancy sketch, like the above, if unprovoked—and were it not provoked, we should scorn the comparison—he considered no insult? or not equal to the one claimed to have been given? Comparisons like these are games of skill, in which the "pawns" are living souls, and the unskillful player suddenly finds himself checkmated with his fingers burnt.

It is a great error, in speaking of the moral lessons to be drawn from the fate of Dr. Webster, not to dwell upon it, in a particular manner, as a most impressive admonition against duplicity and dissimulation, and in favor of cultivating an abhorrence for all the arts of indirection."—N. Y. Post.

\* He said on his arrest, "The villain! he has betrayed me!"

#### A Charge of Forgery.

On p. 117 he says, "The letter in the Herald of July 27, is suspicious. There are many reasons for this conclusion. We doubt that it is either genuine or authentic." The following is the letter referred to:

"Boston, July 1, 1850.

BRO. HIMES:—As our late pastor, with a part of our church and society, have abruptly left us, without giving notice, till the hour they decided to leave, we as the officers of the Chardon St. Church and society, being left destitute, request you to supply our pulpit next Sabbath, and after, as the church and society may desire.  
JOHN LANG, JOHN EMERSON, Elders.  
W. WEST, JAMES KELSEY, Deacons.  
"PETER HOBART, "WM. L. HOPKINSON, Sec'y. "W. WEST, Pres't Soc."



